DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 149 804 JC 780 083

AUTHOR	McIntyre, Catherine; And Others
TITLE	Higher Education for Hispanics: An Evaluation of the LULAC National Education Service Centers.
INSTITUTION	Washington State Board for Community Coll. Education, Seattle. Research and Planning Office.
SPONS AGENCY	Community Services Administration (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	10 Nov 77
NOTE	150p.; Appendices I.A and I.E have been deleted due to poor legibility ; Other portions of appendices may be marginally legible
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Access to Education; College Admission; *Community Agencies (Public); Economically Disadvantaged; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Enrollment; Federal Programs; *Post Secondary Education; Poverty Programs; Program Evaluation; *Spanish Speaking; Student Financial Aid

ABSTRACT

An evaluation was conducted of the effectiveness of the 12 LULAC [League of United Latin American Citizens] National Education Service Centers, Inc. (LNESC), which assist Hispanic and other educationally deprived students in pursuing post-secondary education. The evaluation focused on three LNESC objectives: (1) to increase the number of persons reached; (2) to increase student retention; and (3) to increase public awareness of the educational problems of the Hispanic population. Data were gathered through site visits, mail questionnaires to centers and to students, telephone surveys of Hispanic and social service agencies, and analyses of fiscal information covering the three completed program years (October, 1972, through September, 1976). It was found that 16,362 students had received enrollment assistance, 65% of whom had poverty-level incomes; expenditures per low-income enrollee ranged from $167 to $871; and staff wages were lower than for other public agencies. A lack of supportive follow-up services and retention data demonstrated a need for correction in the second objective. Questionnaire surveys showed that of the 82 students responding, 71% (59) were still enrolled and 8% had graduated; over half of the students judged the LNESC services as very helpful; and community agencies surveyed felt that the centers were necessary. Summary and unit statistics are given, and questionnaires are appended. (RT)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED149804

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Washington State
Board for Community
College Education
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HIGHER EDUCATION FOR HISPANICS:

AN EVALUATION OF THE LULAC NATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS

JC 780 083

By: Catherine McIntyre
and Sally Jackson
Assisted by: Lynn Salter
and Maria Castano, Consultant
Draft: July 7, 1977
Final: November 10, 1977

Research & Planning Office
WASHINGTON STATE BOARD FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
115 North 85th Street #200
Seattle, Washington 98103

CONTENTS

0. SUMMARY 1

1. INTRODUCTION 4

1.1 Background 4
1.2 Design of the Evaluation 4

2. EFFECTIVENESS OF LNESC HEADQUARTERS 5

2.1 CSA Standards 5
2.2 LNESC Objectives 7
2.3 Headquarters Characteristics 8
2.4 Feedback from Centers 8

3. EFFICIENCY OF LNESC HEADQUARTERS 9

3.1 Centralized Fiscal Accounting 9
3.2 Expenditures 10

4. CENTER EFFECTIVENESS 11

4.1 Area 11
4.2 Target Population 11
4.3 Location 13
4.4 Staff 15
4.5 Caseload 15
4.6 Retention/Follow-up 17
4.7 Feedback from Students 20
4.8 Role of Advisory Group 22
4.9 Feedback from the Community 22

5. CENTER EFFICIENCY 24

5.1 Number of Low-Income enrollees as Percent of Target Population 24
5.2 Expenditures: Fixed, Variable, and Total 24
5.3 Expenditure per Person in Target Population 27
5.4 Expenditure per Enrollee (total) 27
5.5 Expenditure per Low-Income Enrollee 27
5.6 Expenditure per Contact (total) 30
5.7 Expenditure per Low-Income Contact 31

6. EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF INDIVIDUAL CENTERS 32

6.1 Albuquerque 32
6.2 Boston 36
6.3 Chicago 40
6.4 Colorado Springs 43
6.5 Corpus Christi 46
6.6 Houston 50
6.7 Phoenix 53
6.8 Pomona 57
6.9 San Francisco 60
6.10 Seattle 63
6.11 Topeka 67

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I Questionnaires Used in Gathering Information for the Evaluation
APPENDIX II Numbers in LNESC Target Population
APPENDIX III Student Questionnaire Responses
APPENDIX IV Follow-Up/Retention Procedures
APPENDIX V Survey of Fiscal Operations

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Size and Composition of Target Population, by State 12
Table 2. Size of Target Population and Number of Low-Income Enrollees, by Center 12
Table 3. Hispanics served by LNESC; Percent Hispanics by Center, by Program Year. 14
Table 4. Average Counselor Caseload, All Program Years, by Center. 16
Table 5. Monthly Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total, by Program Year. 25
Table 6. Funding from Other Sources, Total through Program Year III. 26
Table 7. Expenditure, Enrollment, Contacts and Financial Aid, Channelled, by Center, by Program Year. 28
Table 8. Expenditure per Target Population, Contact, and Enrollee (Total and Low-Income), through Program Year III. 29

0 SUMMARY

0.1 The LULAC National Education Service Centers, Inc. (LNESC) operates centers in twelve cities, which assist Hispanic and other educationally deprived students to pursue post-secondary education, and a National Headquarters in Washington, D.C., which coordinates centers and works to increase public awareness of the educational problems of Hispanics. This evaluation of the effectiveness and efficiency of LNESC was undertaken at the request of the Community Services Administration, which has funded LNESC as a demonstration project since October 1972.

0.2 LNESC meets standards of effectiveness outlined in CSA Instruction 7850-1a.

0.3 The first of LNESC's three prime objectives is to increase the number of educationally disadvantaged and poverty-level persons attending America's colleges and universities, with special emphasis on Spanish-surnamed students. Centers assisted 16,362 students to enroll in post-secondary programs in the first three program years. Sixty-five percent of these persons were poverty-level. LNESC's definition of "educationally disadvantaged" includes additional factors besides income, and would encompass a larger percentage. Spanish-speaking persons comprise over 3/4 of LNESC enrollments.

0.3.1 Some centers (e.g. Seattle and Topeka) serve areas with relatively low concentrations of the target population (low-income Hispanics). Some high-concentration areas in the country are not being served by LNESC; in these areas the Hispanic population consists primarily of persons of Spanish origin other than Mexican-American. Of centers that operate in high-concentration areas, Chicago and Philadelphia serve target populations which are primarily other than Mexican-American.

0.3.2 LNESC centers spend an average of $6 for each member of the target population in areas served; but the amount varies considerable from center to center, reflecting the policy of equal funding for each center without regard to the size of the target population in each area. Centers also vary in the number of students they have helped to enroll; the average expenditure per enrollee ranges from $124 to $685. The most important indicator, the amount centers spend per low-income enrollee, ranges from $167 to $871 per low-income enrollee. Expenditures per contact compares favorably with the cost per client found for Talent Search, a comparable program.

0.3.3 Average monthly expenditures were less in Program Year I, when not all centers were yet established. Higher PY I variable expenditures for centers were more stable in later periods, after a shift to centralized fiscal accounting systems. Salaries and wages for LNESC staff are lower than average for public and non-profit agencies in the same cities. Some minor discrepancies were noted between CSA guidelines and LNESC budget categories, budget procedures, and within LNESC's own travel records.

0.3.4 In the centers that were visited, student files were fairly complete except for information on financial status and financial aid. Clients are recruited through high schools and through community outreach.

0.3.5 CETA and other sources provide additional staff in some centers.

0.4 LNESC's second major objective is to increase the retention of educationally disadvantaged students in America's colleges and universities, with special emphasis on Spanish-surnamed students.

0.4.1 The objective of retention was not pursued in a systematic fashion by LNESC during the first three program years, figures are not available with which to estimate the drop-out rate.

0.4.2 Although no standard procedures are specified by LNESC, all centers do perform some follow-up and retention activity. Counselors at individual centers have developed their own approaches. Nevertheless, the lack of systematic retention studies and provision of supportive follow-up services after enrollment are a serious shortcoming of this program. Specific steps to remedy this would include consultation with experienced counselors who have dealt with the problem, compiling up-to-date and complete lists of enrollees with current addresses and phone numbers, adjustment of the objectives set for new enrollees to allow more counselor time for retention/support services, development of a simple form for reporting retention and follow-up, and obtaining the aid of the colleges and universities where LNESC students are enrolled. The Director reports that steps are now being taken in this direction.

0.5 The third major LNESC objective is to increase the awareness of the educational problems of the Spanish-surnamed population among institutions of higher education, foundations, corporations and federal agencies with the intent of bringing to bear an increased concentration of resources on the problem. The National Headquarters works toward the public awareness objective by contact with national organizations and by coordinating efforts of local LULAC councils to secure scholarship donations from corporate and professional funding sources.

0.6 Centers report that the national headquarters provides good technical assistance in various forms. The most frequently requested changes were more professional inservice training for the staff, and more money (e.g. for staff to do follow-up, and for regional cost of living adjustments).

0.7 Students responding to a mail questionnaire gave mixed by general favorable reactions to the LNESC program. Seventy-one percent of the students, who had been assisted by LNESC three months to four years prior, were still enrolled in school and 8% had graduated. The most frequently received initial service (prior to enrollment) was information about financial aid and assistance in filling out financial aid application forms. Over half the students felt that the services had been very helpful in getting them into school. More than one quarter found the services not very helpful (including some who were already enrolled when they first used LNESC's services and three students who did not remember ever having heard of the center). Questionnaires were sent to about 500 students, 3% of the addresses supplied by each center.

0.8 A telephone survey of Hispanic and social service organizations provided feedback from the communities served by LNESC. These agencies, whose names have been supplied by LNESC centers, felt that the LNESC centers are necessary and that the students who have been provided the services have definitely been helped. CAAs in the communities with LNESC centers had generally less contact and less knowledge of the centers than the Hispanic and social service organizations, and had neutral to positive opinions of the centers.

0.9 Considerable variability exists concerning the selection and function of LNESC Advisory Group.

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

1.1.1 The LULAC National Education Service Centers, Inc. (LNESC) was established in 1972 with a grant from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC). With centers in twelve cities across the country, as well as a national headquarters office, LNESC assists Hispanic and other educationally disadvantaged students to pursue post-secondary education. LNESC was funded as a demonstration project under Title II, Sec. 232 of the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 from October 1, 1972 to November 30, 1974, and again for a third year, and as a special assistance project under Sec. 234 in 1975-76 and 1976-77.

1.1.2 In 1976, CSA requested that the Research & Planning Office of the Washington State Board for Community College Education conduct an evaluation of LNESC's operations. This is the report of that evaluation study. Comments on the first draft were received from the LNESC National Director, the Director of Field Operations, and from center directors. Some of these are included, where pertinent, in the final report.

1.2 Design of the Evaluation

1.2.1 The effectiveness of the program is discussed in this report in terms of (a) the degree to which the project has met standards of effectiveness for Title II of the Community Services Act of 1974 (CSA Instruction 7850-1a); and (b) the degree to which the project has met its own three objectives: to increase enrollment of the target population in colleges and universities, to alleviate the high rate of student attrition, and to increase public awareness of the educational problems this group faces. The efficiency of the program was analyzed by examining operating costs, and comparing these with achievements.

1.2.2 Analyses of effectiveness and efficiency are presented first for LNESC Headquarters and the program overall, next for the centers considered as a group, followed by a breakdown of the individual centers in each city: Albuquerque, NM; Boston, MA; Chicago, IL; Colorado Springs, CO; Corpus Christi, TX; Houston, TX; Phoenix, AZ; Pomona, CA; San Francisco, CA; Seattle, WA; and

Topeka, KS.[1] In order to keep the report to a manageable size, much of the material is included in the form of appendices.

1.2.3 Sources of data for the evaluation. Resources for this evaluation include: field trips to LNESC Headquarters in Washington, D.C. and to five centers--Boston, Chicago, Corpus Christi, Albuquerque, and Seattle; mail questionnaires to all centers and follow-up phone questionnaires to centers which did not receive a field visit; responses to a questionnaire mailed to a random sample (3%) of students enrolled with LNESC assistance; and a telephone survey of Hispanic and social service agencies and CAAs in the twelve cities in which LNESC operates. The questionnaires used in this study are included as Appendix I.

1.2.4 In addition, fiscal information for three completed program years (PY I = October, 1972 through November, 1974; PY II = December, 1974 through September, 1975; and PY III = October, 1975 through September, 1976), proposals, operations reports to CSA from LNESC, and U.S. Department of Labor, and efficiency figures for the Talent Search program were used for comparison where relevant.

2.0 EFFECTIVENESS of LNESC HEADQUARTERS

2.1 CSA Standards

2.1.1 Projects funded under Title II are required to meet at least one of six general standards. Two of these standards are as follows:

2.1.2 (a) Greater use of new types of services and innovative approaches in attacking causes of poverty, so as to develop increasingly effective methods of employing available resources; and

2.1.3 (b) Maximum employment opportunities, including opportunities for further occupational training and career development, for residents of the area and members of the group served.

---

[1] *The twelfth center, in Philadelphia, PA, is not yet fully functional and has not received any of this project's CSA funding. Thus, while some general information was collected on that center, most of the analyses do not include Philadelphia.*

2.1.3 In addition, projects must meet one or more of the specific standards developed for particular programs. No specific standards have been developed, however, for projects funded under Section 234, as LNESC has been since the effective date of CSA Instruction 7850-1a.

Insofar as lack of education is recognized as a contributing cause of poverty, and inasmuch as Hispanics underutilize available resources (less than 3% of those enrolled in post-secondary education in this country--a smaller figure in proportion to their numbers in the population than other minority groups), LNESC may be said to meet the first named standard by providing new types of services to students who would not obtain post-secondary education without this help. In fact, LNESC claims to be responsible for ten percent of all Hispanic enrollment into colleges in the last three years.

2.1.4 During the period covered by the evaluation, LNESC assisted a total of 44,145 persons in their pursuit of higher education, with 16,362 of those enrolling in post-secondary programs. Sixty-three percent of the contacts and 65% of the enrollees met low-income criteria. About 2/3 of the contacts and enrollees were Hispanics.

Insofar as college and vocational education maximizes employment opportunities for those students who obtain it, and inasmuch as employees of the LNESC program--themselves members of the Hispanic community, often low-income--are provided with jobs and a certain amount of career development, LNESC may be said to meet the second named standard.

2.1.5 Aside from these specific standards, the Economic Opportunity Act of 1964 states as its purpose the combatting of poverty "by opening to everyone the opportunity for education and training..." adding that "it is highly desirable to employ the resources of the private sector of the economy of the United States in all....efforts to further the policy of this Act."

2.1.6 By channelling over $11 million in existing financial aid for education to the target population, as well as generating new aid sources from private corporations and institutions through the Lulac National Scholarship Fund, LNESC has conformed to the spirit of the legislation.

2.2 LNESC Objectives

2.2.1 The LULAC National Education Service Centers, Inc. has three specific objectives:

2.2.2 (a) Increase the number of educationally disadvantaged and poverty-level persons attending America's colleges and universities, with special emphasis on Spanish-surnamed students.

2.2.3 (b) Increase the retention of educationally disadvantaged students in America's colleges and universities, with special emphasis on Spanish-surnamed students.

2.2.4 (c) Increase the awareness of the educational problems of the Spanish-surnamed population among institutions of higher education, foundations, corporations and federal agencies with the intent of bringing to bear an increased concentration of resources on the problem.

2.2.5 Enrollments. With regard to their first objective, LNESC has assisted 10,699 low-income persons to enroll in post-secondary education. Low income is only one criterion LNESC uses in defining educationally disadvantaged students; other parts of the problem include:
-Inability to communicate fully in the English language,
-Isolation (geographic and cultural), and
-Lack of education role-models for encouragement and assistance in the pursuit of higher education.
Perhaps because of this complex definition of educationally disadvantaged, 35% of the students enrolled have not met low income criteria. In addition, two centers report being constrained by agreements with schools to serve all students without regard to income.

2.2.6 Over 3/4 of the student enrolled with LNESC assistance are Spanish speaking. The percentage of Hispanics served varies according to center, ranging last year (PY III) from 38% to 98% Hispanics.

2.2.7 Retention. With regard to objective 2, there is no routinized monitoring of retention of LNESC enrollees. Therefore neither the program headquarters nor the centers know what percent of enrollees are still in school. Emphasis on the first goal has diminished the amount of time which is spent in the centers on follow-up retention services. Some follow-up is being done by the centers. However, during the period covered by the evaluation, there has been no policy or procedure for follow-up or for monitoring retention; only two centers have received funding from headquarters for follow-up and retention counselling; and there are no reporting requirements on any follow-up or retention services that are performed in the centers. At present, the director plans to pursue this goal actively (see Section 4.6).

2.2.8 Public awareness. With regard to the third objective, the LNESC Headquarters in Washington, D.C. has focussed on two areas. The first is providing consultation regarding Hispanics to influential public, private and professional organizations. The second is the recent organization of the LULAC National Scholarship program which coordinates efforts by local LULAC councils nationwide with corporate and professional funding resources.

2.3 Headquarters Characteristics

2.3.1 Location. LNESC Headquarters is located at 400 First Street, N.W., Suite 716, Washington, D.C. 20001.

2.3.2 Staff. In April 1977, the D.C. Headquarters of LNESC had a staff of 16: the LNESC National director, his secretary/administrative assistant; an assistant for the scholarship fund; a director for field operations (who operates from Corpus Christi, Texas but spends about two months of the year in D.C.) and his assistant; the director of research and program development, his secretary, and four staff people; the director of the fiscal department, his secretary, and three staff persons. According to the director, four of the sixteen people at headquarters are students working part-time and the salaries of 2 are subsidized by their institutions.

2.4 Feedback from the Centers

2.4.1 Most centers receive two visits each year from LNESC Headquarter staff, and have daily communication with LNESC Headquarters. The most common type of technical assistance provided to the centers by headquarters is information on financial aid, admissions, current legislation, special programs, and general-program administration.

2.4.2 Headquarters has provided general research and technical advice including orientation for new directors, directors' conferences, and instruction in management techniques. The management information system (MIS) and fiscal accounting report formats provide uniform data on the numbers of persons contacted and enrolled by the centers. Headquarters does not require information on retention of enrollees.

2.4.3 Headquarters publishes two periodicals: The LNESC Informer, and The Newsletter. The Informer is an "in-house" publication, one copy of which is regularly sent to each center. All the center directors find the Informer useful, specifically for: exchange between centers of ideas for program activities, fund raising, etc; news on educational issues, legislation, financial aid, admissions, special programs, and headquarters activities; and new resource books and materials. The Newsletter reporting to the centers, informs the community and society at large about the existence and activities of LNESC and its national advocacy role, as well as about educational issues and legislation. All centers receive numerous copies in a timely manner.

2.4.4 When centers were asked what they thought LNESC Headquarters could do differently that would make it more useful to the centers, most frequently mentioned were: more professional in-service training for the staff and more money (higher salaries for better staff, cost of living adjustments, and more staff so that caseloads could be decreased to give more and better services and follow-up). Three centers mentioned that they would appreciate more technical assistance in day-to-day operation (close contact and idea-sharing). One center suggested a WATS line or phone credit card so that centers could contact one another with less cost. Other suggestions from the centers for headquarters include: making a video tape describing LNESC services, taking care of media and publicity affairs, providing money for one staff person who would write reports rather than all the counselors having to write reports, and conducting research and evaluation programs regarding effectiveness and efficiency on both the local and national levels (narrative analysis of monthly numerical MIS reports).

3.0 EFFICIENCY of LNESC HEADQUARTERS

3.1 Centralized Fiscal Accounting

3.1.1 Since Program Year II, fiscal operations have been handled entirely out of the headquarters office. Twenty-eight percent of the 4.2 million dollars of CSA funds for the first three program years was spent at the headquarters level. The centralized fiscal accounting has the advantage of much better accountability to CSA through systematic record keeping and tighter control over variable costs.

3.1.2 One disadvantage of the centralized fiscal accounting system resides in the apportionment of funds to the centers. A uniform salary scale for all centers does not take into account variations in the cost of living, particularly between the southwest, where it is quite low, and other parts of the country. Since the qualifications required for a counselling position are standard nationwide, the standard salary scale results in lower than average rates of pay for counselors in areas outside the southwest. This has undoubtedly been a factor in staff turnover and resultant discontinuity of service. *Director's comment:* "As a policy, we do consider cost of living differences between parts of the country by starting new employees in Boston, Chicago and San Francisco one step higher on the LNESC salary schedule than new employees in other locations. Further, the rate of staff turnover, especially for counselors, is currently low."

3.2 Expenditures

3.2.1 Appendix V gives a survey of LNESC Fiscal Operations. Salaries and wages for LNESC clerical and counselling staff are somewhat lower than average for public and non-profit agencies in the same cities; vacation leave is more generous than average. A personal security plan, which replaces the Social Security program, is authorized for LNESC employees. Salaries, wages and fringe benefits have accounted for 69% of the total grant expenditures for the three program years examined (Appendix V).

3.2.2 LNESC average monthly (total) expenditures were somewhat less in Program Year I, when not all centers were yet established, than in the following two periods, during which all eleven centers were operational. And whereas the higher levels of variable expenditures for centers in PY I concentrated on coordination and development activities (e.g. travel and consultants), the second and third program years show a more stable budget.

3.2.3 Expenditure categories, as reported by LNESC, do not coincide exactly with CSA budget categories. Policy concerning budget flexibility does not conform exactly to CSA instructions (however, see Director's comment, Appendix V p. V2). Records for consultants and consultants' travel were not reconciled with invoices.

4.0 CENTER EFFECTIVENESS

4.1 Area

4.1.1 LNESC operates 11 centers in 9 states. A twelfth center, in Philadelphia, is not funded by CSA and will not be considered in the evaluation. The analysis of centers includes Albuquerque, Boston, Chicago, Colorado Springs. Corpus Christi, Houston, Phoenix, Pomona, San Francisco, Seattle, and Topeka, for the first three program years (through September 30, 1976).

4.2 Target Population

4.2.1 Table 1, based on 1970 census figures,[2] presents the size and composition of the primary target population (low-income persons of Spanish origin) for states with over 100,000 Hispanics. These figures were compiled and examined for two reasons:

4.2.2 (1) to examine LNESC's first two objectives--raising enrollments and retention of Spanish-speaking students (in particular, were the centers located in the areas where low-income Hispanics predominated),

4.2.3 (2) to see whether all Hispanics (Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans, Cubans, and others of Spanish origin) were being asisted equally by the LULAC National Education Service Centers.

4.2.4 From Table 1, it is evident that not all centers are located in states with a high concentration of Hispanics; in fact, three centers are located in states with less than 100,000 Hispanics (Boston, Seattle, and Topeka). In addition, for the states having over 50,000 low-income Hispanics, there are no centers in New York, New Jersey, or Florida. In new York and New Jersey the

---

[2] *It is widely acknowledged that the 1970 census seriously undercounted Hispanics. Therefore, the numbers in column one, low-income Hispanics, are considerably lower than the actual number of those persons in the population. However, there is no evidence that the census undercounted inconsistently; therefore, the numbers, though lower than the actual number of low-income Hispanics, do represent relative sizes of the target population when comparing between states.*

TABLE 1

Size & Composition of Target Population by State: Low Income Persons of Spanish Origin in States with over 100,000 Hispanics[1]

	No. Low Income	Percent	Percent	Percent	Percent
	TOTAL	Mexican American	Puerto Rican	Cuban	Other Spanish Origin
TEXAS	684,474	93	1	1	7
CALIFORNIA	431,759	83	2	2	13
NEW YORK	345,463	1	82	3	14
NEW MEXICO	101,704	44	1	1	56
FLORIDA	76,225	11	10	52	27
ARIZONA	68,000	94	1	1	6
NEW JERSEY	58,775	1	67	16	17
ILLINOIS	56,509	35	36	4	26
COLORADO	54,950	51	1	1	49
PENNSYLVANIA	23,563	5	67	2	26
MICHIGAN	19,969	46	6	3	45
OHIO	18,553	25	18	1	56
INDIANA	10,407	28	8	2	62

[1] *Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the population, 1970, vol. 1.*

TABLE 2

Size of Target Population and Number of Low-Income Enrollees, by Center

Center	Target Population[2]	Number of Low-income Enrolless	Percent of target Population
POMONA	195,252	749	0.4%
CORPUS CHRISTI	56,510	1,440	2.5%
ALBUQUERQUE	55,094	1,664	3.0%
PHOENIX	39,923	1,744	4.4%
HOUSTON	37,149	1,278	3.4%
CHICAGO	36,344	576	1.6%
SAN FRANCISCO	15,605	922	5.9%
COLORADO SPRINGS	12,794	1,332	10.4%
BOSTON	7,466	167	2.2%
SEATTLE	6,860	489	7.1%
TOPEKA	5,990	338	5.6%
TOTAL	468,987	10,699	2.3%

[2] *See Appendix II*

Hispanics are primarily Puerto Rican, in Florida they are primarily Cuban. *Director's comment:* "A site in New Jersey is proposed for 1978. In addition to Chicago and Philadelphia, our San Francisco and Boston field centers also serve a Hispanic target population other than Mexican Americans."

4.2.5 Table 2 shows the target populations (low-income Hispanics over 18) calculated from 1970 census data for the centers, in order of target population size.[3] Appendix II shows how the target population was calculated for each county and for each center's target area. Table 3 shows the percentage of the contacts and enrollees who were Hispanics for each program year. Note that data for PY I and II are incomplete. For Program Year III, nearly all the centers show half their contacts and enrollees as Hispanics (which of course is well above the proportion of Hispanics in the population in each target area). Centers where Hispanics comprise less than half the contacts and enrollees are Houston and Topeka; both these centers have access to high schools on the condition that they provide service to all students who wish it.

4.3 Location

4.3.1 All of the centers are located within easy access of the Spanish-speaking low-income population. Some centers utilize "outposts" when the Hispanics population is dispersed. Some difficulties we turned up included extremely cramped quarters at the Chicago center, with inadequate privacy for students during counselling and no room to house additional staff. Another problem is that some of the centers have moved several times, creating some confusion as to their whereabouts (and perhaps even their existence).

---

[3] *An important finding from the field visits was that nearly all the counselors felt the definition of low income to be too low. They felt that while low income guidelines are appropriate for the basics of existence, the amount of money which would keep a family alive and housed may not allow them to send one or two children to college. They pointed out that the American College Testing guidelines for waiving of testing fees, and the college board admissions testing program fee waiver guidelines are considerably higher than the low income guidelines they must follow in assisting students. In addition, some centers noted that a single standard definition for low income does not take into account geographic variation in the cost of living so that the same income does not reflect the same standard of living from one area of the country to another.*

TABLE 3

Hispanics Served by LNESC;
Percent Hispanics by Center by Program Year

	Percent Hispanic						
	Program Yr I		Program Yr II		Program Yr III		Population in Target Area[4]
Center	Contacts	Enrollees	Contacts	Enrollees	Contacts	Enrollees	
Albuquerque	78%	?	98%	?	82%	79%	49%
Boston	?	?	?	86%	97%	78%	1%
Chicago	53%	60%	74%	?	98%	98%	5%
Colorado Springs	61%	?	51%[1]	?	70%	72%	17%
Corpus Christi	74%	?	79%	?	82%	83%	47%
Houston	79%	?	?	97%	48%	47%	11%
Phoenix	72%	?	51%	53%	58%	53%	17%
Pomona	92%	?	89%	91%	78%	78%	17%
San Francisco	86%	?	51%[2]	?	78%	81%	13%
Seattle	80%	?	30%[3]	?	68%	59%	2%
Topeka	66%	?	40%	?	35%	38%	2%

[1] *33% "other" (Unspecified)*
[2] *29% " "*
[3] *57% " "*
[4] *from 1970 census*

4.4 Staff

4.4.1 CSA funds 59 full-time and two part-time employees in the centers. Thirteen full-time staff and 14 part-time staff are funded by other sources (CETA, work-study, etc.). In general, CSA funds provide a basic staff for each center of five to six full-time persons including a project director, 3 or 4 counselors, and a secretary. Other funding sources provide both full-time and part-time counselors and clerical support.

4.5 Caseload

4.5.1 Table 4 presents the average number of counselors at each center, plus a calculation of the new contacts per counselor for each month and the average annual caseload for each counselor, based on the number of contacts each center reported for the first three program years and the number of months the center was in operation as of September 30, 1976. The average number of new contacts per counselor each month is about 30.[4] Topeka and Pomona have the lowest number of contacts, San Francisco and Houston the highest.[5] The average annual caseload is between 300 and 250 clients.

4.5.2 Recruitment. Counselors recruit potential enrollees in two general ways:

4.5.3 (a) High school recruiting activity ranges from the LNESC counselor having an "office" and a set schedule for meeting with students right in the high school to one annual presentation by the LNESC staff member to juniors and seniors in a career counselling class. In many cases, high school counselling staff do not refer students to LNESC. Reasons for this include the counselors feeling threatened in their professional role by sharing counselling tasks with "an outsider", or/and reluctance

---

[4] *There appears to be some inconsistency in practice, across centers, as to the conditions under which a returnee might get counted as a new contact, new enrollment, or new financial aid channelled.*

[5] *The Houston number is suspect, based on an extremely high number of contacts reported for PY II.*

TABLE 4

LNESC

Average Caseload: Students per Counselor By Center - Program Years I, II and III

Center	Average Number of Counselors	New Contacts/ Counselor/ Month	Average Annual Caseload
Albuquerque	4.5[1]	25	300
Cambridge (Boston)	2	28	331
Chicago	3	30	409
Colorado Springs	3	29	345
Corpus Christi	4.4	24	287
Houston	4	64	766
Phoenix	5	30	360
Pomona	4.5[1]	19	223
San Francisco	3	40	476
Seattle	3	23	271
Topeka	4	18	218

[1] *Does not include one counselor assigned to follow-up.*

to refer only "low-income", or Hispanic students for educational assistance, or/and the counselor being insensitive to the educational potential of "average" students.[6]

4.5.4 (b) Community outreach is the other primary source of clients. Many centers work closely with other Hispanic social service agencies in the community. In addition, they rely on Spanish-speaking media to alert potential students to the services they provide. The greater age range reached through community outreach has three advantages. It allows for informing and motivating the student's family as to the value and availability of higher education. Children exposed to a college-oriented outlook can plan their high school career accordingly. Persons in young adulthood and mid-life who are potentially strong students would not be reached through high schools.

4.5,5 Student files. From files examined on field trips to five centers, records show an average of 3.2 contacts per student. About 44% of those were face-to-face contacts, 40% phone, and 14% mail. Over 3/4 of the sessions noted in the files concern financial aid; 16% were academic/career counselling. About 1/2 the student files we looked at were contacts, half were enrollees. The files were fairly complete; an exception was information on the student's (or student's spouse's) income; almost half had no copies of completed financial aid forms; and almost two-thirds had no indication of parent's income. Appendix I.D includes a copy of the form used in reviewing student files for the evaluation. *Director's comment:* "A large proportion of Financial Aid Forms are completed away from the field center office and copying facilities are usually not available. Further, financial aid information is recorded at enrollment, usually in September. The evaluation team reviewed the files in June."

4.6 Retention/Follow-up

4.6.1 In spite of the fact that retention of enrollees is a goal of the LNESC program, the management information system policy, and procedures of the organization provide little support for retention and follow-up services. Procedures are specified for follow-up of contacts only until they are enrolled.

---

[6] *Over and over again, we heard from LNESC counselors of instances where Hispanic students had been turned away by high school counselors because they "are not college material," have achieved their potential by even finishing high school, or would fit best in a trade or vocational program.*

4.6.2 Despite this lack of direction from the program management, all the centers are performing some follow-up and retention activity. The sorts of such activities they are performing include mail and telephone contact once per year with enrollees to see if they are enrolled, if they have received additional financial aid, or if they are having problems. In addition, center staff who have close ties with the community can informally check up on students; for those centers who have solicited cooperation from colleges and universities, financial aid and admissions staff assist them in confirming enrollment and financial aid for LNESC enrollees. Many counselors try to encourage the students to become independent of the center's services, including filling out the financial aid forms for their second year of college, etc.

4.6.3 The lack of systematic retention studies and of provision of supportive follow-up services after enrollment is a serious shortcoming of this program. The problem appears to be that the stress on new enrollment, including regular reporting of enrollees and contacts, has become more important than retention and follow-up. Further, with each year the program is in operation the number of enrollees from past years accumulate so that counselors not only have an ongoing caseload of 250-350 clients, but in addition have an increasing group of past enrollees to follow-up.

4.6.4 What seems necessary in order to accomplish both goals is:

4.6.5 (1) Counselors should pool their ideas and share their resources. The experience of counselors who have grappled with this problem should be utilized--particularly staff at Albuquerque and Corpus Christi centers who have devoted time to developing follow-up programs and procedures. (Appendix IV shows samples of two instruments developed at these centers.)

4.6.6 (2) Up-to-date lists of enrollees since the inception of the program, with most recent addresses and phone numbers, should be compiled. (When we attempted to get such a list from the centers, we found that lists were incomplete in some cases, and contained duplications in others.)

4.6.7 (3) Based on the experience of the center, headquarters should examine the objectives set for new enrollees, and adjust those figures downward to allow more counselor time for retention/supportive services.

4.6.8 (4) Next, headquarters should develop a simple form for reporting retention and follow-up (at least annually). Information on such a form would include the number of students whom counselors had attempted to follow-up, the number they had reached, the number of those who were enrolled; for those enrolled, their financial aid status, and any problems they are having staying in school; for those not enrolled, the number, and what the reason for dropping out. In addition, some record of the number of graduates should be kept.[7]

4.6.9 (5) Finally, some process should be developed for enlisting the aid of the colleges and universities in which LNESC students are enrolled, to facilitate cooperative support services for Hispanic, low-income students. Such a process might include use of a signed release form (such as is in use in Albuquerque) which authorizes the college to tell the LNESC follow-up staff whether the student is enrolled, whether he has financial aid, etc. In addition, annual visits or/and written reports to the college financial aid offices, admissions offices, minority programs staff, and student support organizations, should be made by the center staff.

4.6.10 It should be noted that many of these activities are already taking place; what is needed is a systematic format so that Community Services Administration and the LNESC management can assess their progress in meeting their second program goal.[8]

---

[7] Director's comment: *"Fourteen months ago, on the basis of not being able to improve all system at once, I elected to forego any national system on retention until we had our major management information system overhauled, debugged, and in place. We now have the best MIS in the business and are ready to build on the best retention experience of our field centers. We have proposed a special study of retention/follow up to CSA. We are searching for funds this year to hire as a consultant the best person in this area of higher education. Retention/follow up will also be a main topic of our management conference scheduled for September 25 to October 1 at the Marymount College in Arlington, Virginia. A national system for measuring performance in this area will be developed and implemented."*

4.7 Feedback from Students

4.7.1 As part of the evaluation, each center was asked for a list of all the students they had enrolled during the first three program years. From the lists was selected a random sample (equal to 3% of total enrollment) of students who were then mailed a questionnaire (See Appendix I.E). Four-hundred ninety questionnaires were mailed out; 82 were returned to the sender by the post office. Of 409 presumably delivered, 83 questionnaires were completed and returned--a 20% rate of return.

4.7.2 Appendix III summarizes student responses separately by center. Overall, more than 3/4 of the students who returned questionnaires were Hispanics; 88% were under 25 years of age. Seventy-one percent (59 students) were still enrolled in school; 15 students were not, and 8% of the students had graduated. About 1/3 of the students had first heard about LULAC National Education Service Centers from friends, while half had learned about it through high school (either through a high school counselor or when someone from the center came to their school). Three students said they had never heard of the center. Nearly half the students were in high school at the time of their first contact, while 23% had just graduated. Seventeen percent of the students were already enrolled in college when they first heard about LNESC. Two were college drop-outs, four were drop-outs from high school.

4.7.3 We asked students how many times they had had contact with the center before they were enrolled in college;

---

[8] *In one of the funding proposals prepared by LNESC, early in the program, a suggestion was made that retention efforts by the program would lower the drop-out rate from 80% to 10%. In setting measurable objectives, it might be useful to take into account the fact that the drop-out rate for college students in general is not below 50%. The problem of retention is an important but difficult one. We might mention also that a 1975 evaluation of Talent Search, a similar program funded by HEW, noted that that program has difficulty with adequate follow-up of students to confirm enrollment. LNESC does seem to be performing adequately in this respect, at least. (See also section 5.6 for efficiency comparisons with Talent Search.)*

29% of the students said that they had had no contact with the center before enrollment; half the students had contact more than three times before enrollment.[9] The most frequently received initial service (prior to enrollment) was information about financial aid and assistance in filling out financial aid application forms. About half the students said they had received information about admissions, and help filling out admissions forms. Over half of the students felt that the service had been very helpful in getting them into school. Twenty-eight percent found the services not very helpful. (Some because they were already in school.)

4.7.4 Thirty-seven percent of the students said that they had no contact with the center since they had been enrolled in school. Thirty-four percent had been seen once or twice. Most of the students who had received services from the center after enrollment had needed financial aid or employment. Fourteen received this assistance from the center, 29 were referred by the center to another source. Over a third of the students felt that the services had been most helpful towards staying in school. Another third found them not very helpful, and the final third had received no follow-up supportive services.

4.7.5 When asked what they thought the center could do differently to make it more helpful to students, nearly a quarter said they thought the center was fine as it is, and over a quarter said they didn't know or gave no answer. The other half had suggestions.

4.7.6 The single most commonly requested improvement was for follow-up support for students once in school (e.g. "divide their services so upper classmen and entering freshmen get the same benefits," "get in touch with students personally"). Suggested nearly as often was better publicizing of services so that potential clients are aware of it.

---

[9] *No contact with the center was reported for two different reasons: In some cases, students were already enrolled when they sought LNESC assistance with financial aid application, academic counselling, etc. It appears, however, that a number of students interpreted the question literally and reported no contact with the center if their contact with a counselor took place somewhere other than the center. Some students, for example, reported services received prior to enrollment and yet no contact with the center. We were not sufficiently familiar with recruitment procedures at the time of devising the questionnaire to anticipate the difficulty and word the question more precisely.*

4.7.7 The largest block of varied suggestions seemed to reflect the students' feeling that they need all the help they can get. These suggestions concerned more attention from staff—expressed in terms of taking more time with the client, being more understanding of clients' problems, taking more interest in students, being more encouraging--as well as broadening and deepening services already given (counselling, help with students' other problems; better explanation of financial aid material and more complete list of available sources of aid, continuing to inform students after they're in school; more academic major and career guidance; more complete list of services, facilities students may be eligible for). At least one student specified that more staff and larger budget for the center would help.

4.7.8 More money, employment, and transportation were mentioned as needs. Also suggested was that students be contacted earlier in high school and be given motivation and assistance in planning courses to take, etc. in preparation for college.

4.8 Role of Advisory Group

4.8.1 There appears to be some confusion about the selection and function of LNESC Advisory Groups. In some cases, Advisory Group members are selected by LULAC state chairmen; in other cases, membership on the Advisory Board is by recommendation from center staff. In at least two centers, Chicago and Boston, little support is provided the center by LULAC. This stems from the fact that LULAC is most active in the Southwest (there are only about 100 LULAC members in the entire state of Illinois, and no LULAC councils in Massachusetts). It would seem that there should be definite guidelines as to the constitution of the membership of the Advisory Group (including students, parents, the low-income category, educational representatives, and community representatives--allowing for considerable overlap). The LNESC could probably benefit from consulting with CSA regarding the experience of the Community Action Program with advisory groups.

4.9 Feedback from the Community

4.9.1 A final part of our evaluation was a phone survey of Hispanic and/or social service organizations in the communities servied by LNESC, and a survey of CAAs in these cities. A copy of the questions asked in these surveys appears in Appendix I.F.

4.9.2 Community organizations. A list of organizations each center has relationships with was supplied by center directors in answer to question 22 of the Center Mail Questionnaire (see Appendix I.B). These organizations were called by a consultant for the evaluation, who is herself a Hispanic person, and asked about their interaction with and opinions of the LNESC center in their area.

4.9.3 Of 65 organizations for whom contact was attempted, 26 were reached. Of these 26 organizations, in twelve cities including Philadelphia, 18 are in regular contact with the centers. Three or four persons contacted were not familiar with the center and its services. All centers are in regular contact with and work in cooperation with at least one of the local community organizations contacted.

4.9.4 Seventeen organizations gave positive assessments of the LNESC centers in their areas, and several had no opinion. Only two expressed negative opinions (of Boston and Topeka), and both of these felt that personnel changes that had already taken place seemed to be clearing up the respective problems. The general consensus was that there is a great need in the Spanish community for LNESC's services, and that the services provided are very good.

4.9.5 Most (19) organizations felt that the local LNESC center was well known to the Spanish-speaking community, but one agency in each of four cities thought that more outreach and publicity was needed. Two centers were praised for being available during hours that are convenient for working people (Boston and Chicago). Several persons mentioned the need for more follow up.

4.9.6 CAAs. A community action agency was identified in each of the cities with LNESC centers, except Seattle. One of these CAAs was never reached and another refused to answer questions over the telephone. Of the nine CAA spokesmen we interviewed, eight were familiar with the local LNESC, including one who specified that the LNESC center was a delegate agency of the CAA (Los Angeles-Pomona), and at one CAA no one knew anything about LNESC.

4.9.7 Five of the nine CAAs had had some contact with the center and three worked in cooperation with LNESC. Three CAA spokesmen had positive opinions of LNESC, four had no opinion, and one wanted to reserve judgement. One reported that his CAA had had a negative experience with LNESC, but was not sure that the program he was referring to was in fact LNESC (San Francisco).

4.9.8 Five CAA spokesmen were not able to give an opinion as to how well known the center is in the Spanish-speaking community, two centers were thought to be well-known, and one was thought definitely to need better outreach and publicity (Houston). One person mentioned a university study which gave the LNESC center there good marks for effectiveness (Chicago). One was impressed with his center's outreach to prisoners and ex-convicts (Pomona).

5.0 CENTER EFFICIENCY

5.1 Number of Low-Income Enrollees as Percent of Target Population.

5.1.1 The number of low-income students each center enrolled was given in Table 2, as well as the percentage of the target population (low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over 18) the enrollees represent.[10]

5.1.2 For the target population of almost 500,000 (total), well over 10,000 low-income persons have been enrolled--2.3% of the target population.

5.2 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total

5.2.1 Table 5 shows the average amount of CSA funding spent per month by each center in each program year, based on the number of months each center was actually in operation. Average monthly expenditures were greatest in the first period, PY I, in both fixed and variable categories. Equipment and out-of-town travel account for a large portion of the greater average outlay during the first period of operation, but monthly expenditures in most categories do tend to decline somewhat in each successive program year.

5.2.2 The LULAC National Education Service Centers attracted over $169,000 in funding from other sources, as of 1976. Nearly all this money was spent on additional staff; most of it was from the Department of Labor CETA Titles. Table 6 shows the amount and source of non CSA

---

[10] *The LNESC MIS does not record how many low-income enrollees are Hispanics; since on the average about 3/4 of the enrollees are Hispanic the numbers in column 4 of Table 2 (percent of target population) probably are high. The assumption made in computing column 4 is that one low-income enrollee is as good as another in the eyes of the Community Services Act.*

TABLE 5

Monthly Center Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total, by Program Year*

	Program Year I	Program Year II	Program Year III	Total Years
ALBUQUERQUE				
Fixed Exp/mo	$7300	$6152	$6299	
Variable Exp/mo	270	143	171	
Total Exp/mo	7570	6295	6469	$6868
BOSTON				
Fixed Exp/mo	7881	4053	4508	
Variable Exp/mo	1176	342	90	
Total Exp/mo	9056	4395	4598	5348
CHICAGO				
Fixed Exp/mo	11631	6831	5224	
Variable Exp/mo	1227	696	3	
Total Exp/mo	12858	7527	5226	8330
COLORADO SPRINGS				
Fixed Exp/mo	7527	8114	7063	
Variable Exp/mo	257	85	194	
Total Exp/mo	7784	8119	7256	7729
CORPUS CHRISTI				
Fixed Exp/mo	7478	8192	8569	
Variable Exp/mo	205	110	136	
Total Exp/mo	7683	8302	8705	8122
HOUSTON				
Fixed Exp/mo	8414	7921	7341	
Variable Exp/mo	737	240	233	
Total Exp/mo	9150	8161	7574	8412
PHOENIX				
Fixed Exp/mo	7809	7364	6338	
Variable Exp/mo	652	246	64	
Total Exp/mo	8460	7610	6401	7630
POMONA				
Fixed Exp/mo	8068	6003	6528	
Variable Exp/mo	550	140	135	
Total Exp/mo	8618	6143	6662	7279
SAN FRANCISCO				
Fixed Exp/mo	8525	7003	6116	
Variable Exp/mo	235	90	253	
Total Exp/mo	8760	7093	6369	7500
SEATTLE				
Fixed Exp/mo	8094	4941	5793	
Variable Exp/mo	575	431	140	
Total Exp/mo	8669	5372	5932	6840
TOPEKA				
Fixed Exp/mo	8776	553	7620	
Variable Exp/mo	672	178	293	
Total Exp/mo	9447	6731	7913	8181
ALL CENTERS				
Fixed Exp/mo	8191	6648	6491	
Variable Exp/mo	526	245	155	
Total Exp/mo	8716	6893	6646	7535

*See also Table V.1 (Appendix V)

TABLE 6

Funding from Other Sources, Total through Program Year III

Center	Amount	Source
Albuquerque	$ 23,537	CETA
Boston	2,149	CETA
Chicago	---	----
Colorado Springs	17,127	CETA, WIN
Corpus Christi	68,871	CETA (Titles I and IV), Texas Comm. on Alchoholism, Texas Dept. of Comm. Affairs
Houston	12,200	Exxon
Phoenix	9,355	CETA
Pomona	12,100	CETA, WIN
San Francisco	---	----
Seattle	---	----
Topeka	23,974	City of Topeka
TOTAL	$169,313	

funds for each center. *Director's comment:*"[A] further... $177,000 in private funds [was] raised in 1977 for the National Scholarship Fund for Americans of Spanish Origin, administered by LNESC. The 1978 goal in $350,000. The 1979 goal is $600,000. And we recently have been awarded a grant from HEW in Pennyslvania of $67,127 for the first of three years."

5.2.3 Table 7 shows total expenditures for centers along with the number of enrollments, number of contacts and amount of financial aid channelled.

5.3 Expenditure per Target Population

5.3.1 The LULAC National Education Service Centers spend an average of $6 for each member of the target population in the areas they serve. The range in the amount spent is considerable, however--from $1 per target person in Pomona to $49 in Topeka. This wide range of expenditures reflects the LNESC policy of equal funding to each center regardless of the size of target population; therefore, funding was stretched much thinner over Pomona's 185,000 target persons than, for instance, Topeka's 6,000. Table 8 shows the figures for each center over the first three program years.

5.4 Expenditure per Enrollee (total)

5.4.1 With approximately the same amount of money, centers have enrolled considerably different numbers of enrollees. The average expenditure per enrollee for all centers is $160 (Table 8). Boston had the highest cost per enrollee ($685), Seattle was next at $409 per enrollee. During the first three program years, the Boston center, in Cambridge, concentrated its efforts on enrolling students from the southwest in Ivy League schools, and the number of low-income enrollees they produced was 167, the lowest of any center. (With a new director and a revised place in LNESC's strategy, the Boston center is currently concentrating on serving its eastern Massachusetts target area.)

5.5 Expenditure per Low-Income Enrollee

5.5.1 A more precise measure of efficiency than expenditure per enrollee is the expenditure per low-income enrollee, since low-income persons (especially Spanish-speaking) constitute the program's target population. Topeka has spent $871 for each of its low-income enrollees, Boston $878 (Table 8). In comparison, Albuquerque has spent $167 per low-income enrollee, followed by Phoenix at $180. Boston's high expenditure per low-income enrollee is consistent with the discussion of expenditure per enrollee above. For Topeka, however, the high expenditure per low-income enrollee stems from another source. Topeka keeps poor records on the

TABLE 7

Expenditures, Enrollments, Contacts, and Financial Aid Channeled, by Center, by Program Year

		Total Months	Total Expend.	Enrollments	Contacts	Financial Aid
	Albuq.	15	$ 113,552	774	1,261	$ 603,100
	Boston	5	45,282	20	342	-0-
	Chicago	10	128,576	126	1,038	54,300
	Col.Spr.	18	140,104	627	1,511	770,300
	Cor.Chr.	20	153,661	888	1,767	941,200
PY I	Houston	17	155,551	607	1,889	334,800
	Phoenix	18	152,284	816	3,164	645,100
	Pomona	14	120,647	441	1,713	311,500
	San. Fr.	14	122,635	628	1,796	186,500
	Seattle	14	121,367	272	1,131	266,900
	Topeka	14	132,263	224	834	754,000
Total Centers		159	$1,385,922	5,423	16,446	$4,867,700
	Albq.	10	$ 62,948	622	728	$ 435,400
	Boston	10	43,945	69	588	94,600
	Chicago	10	75,265	207	1,295	137,300
	Col. Spr.	10	81,990	501	806	787,400
	Cor. Chr.	10	83,018	925	1,106	1,129,400
PY II	Houston	10	81,614	731	6,606	635,200
	Phoenix	10	76,102	1,019	1,210	543,400
	Pomona	10	61,431	296	964	199,700
	San Fr.	10	70,925	438	1,640	60,400
	Seattle	10	53,723	115	434	135,100
	Topeka	10	67,309	357	558	401,600
Total Centers		110	$758,270	5,280	15,935	$4,559,500
	Albuq.	12	$ 77,631	700	1,104	$ 605,500
	Boston	12	55,181	125	560	350,000
	Chicago	12	62,717	351	947	362,900
	Col Spr.	12	87,075	479	1,138	627,800
	Cor. Chr.	12	104,458	1,136	1,544	1,094,300
PY III	Houston	12	90,885	858	1,464	856,200
	Phoenix	12	76,814	654	1,728	363,700
	Pomona	12	79,949	170	338	107,200
	San Fr.	12	76,427	436	849	152,100
	Seattle	12	71,187	218	871	267,900
	Topeka	12	94,955	532	1,221	519,300
Total Centers		132	$877,279	5,659	11,764	$5,306,900

TABLE 8

Expenditure per Target Population, Contact, and Enrollee (Total and low-income), by Center, through Program Year III

Center	Exp/Target Population	Exp/ Contact	Exp/Low-Income Contact	Exp/ Enrollee	Exp/Low-Income Enrollee
Albuquerque	$ 5	$ 91	$112	$132	$167
Boston	20	98	111	685	878
Chicago	7	81	87	390	463
Colorado Springs	26	94	115	203	245
Corpus Christi	8	83	173	124	254
Houston	9	34	67	155	266
Phoenix	8	52	75	126	180
Pomona	1	91	138	302	442
San Francisco	17	63	103	180	293
Seattle	36	101	151	409	504
Topeka	49	113	600	265	871
All Centers*	$76	$ 60	$ 94	$160	$248

**Ratios calculated for centers as a group* financial status of their contacts and enrollees. They claimed this is because students do not have the information; other centers have solved this problem. Phoenix and Albuquerque spend only $21 to $23 more per low-income enrollee than for total enrollees; this indicates they are concentrating their services on the low-income population.

5.6 Expenditure per Contact (total)

5.6.1 Expenditure per contact ranges from $34 in Houston to $113 in Topeka (Table 8). The expenditure per contact shows some relationship to the concentration of Hispanics; i.e. the three highest expenditures per contact are in the three cities with the lowest numbers of low-income Hispanics over the age of 18 (Topeka, Seattle and Boston). As indicated in the discussion of caseload (4.5), Houston reported an extraordinarily high number of contacts in Program Year II; therefore, expenditure per contact (and per low-income contact) is abnormally low. The average expenditure per contact for all centers combined is $60.

5.6.2 The Department of Health Education and Welfare operates a program called Talent Search which "provides educational opportunity for the low-income educationally disadvantaged." The objectives of the program are to improve this group's educational and vocational status and self-perception, and increase school and community awareness of their needs. A 1975 evaluation of the Talent Search program, using totals for 96 projects, found an average cost per client of $64. This compares with $60 for LNESC centers, calculated the same way; the TS definition of "client" is comparable to LNESC's "contact"--a person who had at least one official contact with the project, and for whom the project had created a file. Talent Search costs per client ranged from $23 to $392 with a mean of $89; this compares with LNESC's mean of $82 and range of $34 to $113. It appears that LNESC's services are comparable in cost to those of the Talent Search program.[11]

---

[11] *Research Triangle Institute, Center for Educational Research and Evaluation, Final Report: A Study of the National Upward Bound and Talent Search Program, Volume 3 "Descriptive Study of the Talent Search Program" December 1975.*

5.7 Expenditure per Low-Income Contact

5.7.1 Centers spent from $67 (Houston) to $600 (Topeka) for each low-income contact (Table 8). Topeka's figure is affected by incomplete reporting of its contacts' financial status. The next highest center, Corpus Christi, spent $173 per low-income contact; in part this is because of the very low number of low-income contacts for Program Year II and III.[12] Houston's $67 per low-income contact may be abnormally low because of the surprisingly high number of enrollees reported in Program Year II. Both Phoenix and Chicago have demonstrated low cost for the low-income contacts they made, at $75 and $87, respectively. The median value for all the individual centers is $112; and LNESC Centers taken as a group have spent $94 of total resources for each low-income contact made.

---

[12] *The counselors at the Corpus Christi center claim that their impact on the low-income contact target population is constrained by their working agreement with the area high schools. In order to gain cooperation from the high schools, the center agreed to serve all the students who desired LNESC services, regardless of income. Topeka reports this is true for that center also.*

6.0 EFFECTIVENESS AND EFFICIENCY OF INDIVIDUAL CENTERS

6.1 ALBUQUERQUE

6.1.1 Area. The Albuquerque LNESC serves eleven counties in all parts of New Mexico (121,670 square miles). Appendix II shows the counties served. About 90 percent of the services of the center are provided to Bernalillo County (Albuquerque), while 10 percent of the contacts are made in other parts of the state (Las Cruces, Silver City, etc.).

6.1.2 Target population. In the area served there are 55,094 low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over the age of 18 (see Appendix II).

6.1.3 Location. The Albuquerque LNESC is located at 510 Second Street N.W., Suite 109. The office is in an urban renewal area at the very center of the city. It is 5 to 10 minutes from the colleges and universities located in Albuquerque.

6.1.4 Staff. The center has a director, a secretary (both full-time), five full-time and one part-time counselors. Two counselors are funded by CETA; the other staff are CSA-funded. All counselors have Bachelors' degrees and all are bilingual. CETA employees are funded through a city program; the state is being solicited for CETA counselors for outposts outside Albuquerque.

6.1.5 Caseload. The counselors provide services to about 10-20 students per week. The center makes 103 new contacts per month (about 25 new contacts per month for each counselor). One counselor is assigned to follow-up; the others' average caseload is 300 new students per year. Each counselor is assigned intake duty time during which he/she schedules no appointments and provides services to walk-in students.

6.1.5.1 The Albuquerque LNESC has a computer tie-in, financed by the Albuquerque school district, which provides current information on careers, programs, tuition, admissions, financial aid, and scholarships.

6.1.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	635	low-income enrollees (estimated)[13]
PY II	458	low-income enrollees (estimated)[13]
PY III	571	low-income enrollees
Total	1,664	low-income enrollees (estimated)[13]

1,664 ÷ 55,094 = 3.02% of target population enrolled.

6.1.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$109,502	$4,050	$113,552
PY II	61,515	1,433	62,948
PY III	75,582	2,049	77,631
All year		Subtotal--CSA	$254,131
CETA	23,537	Subtotal--CETA	23,537
		TOTAL	$277,668

6.1.8 Expenditure per target population.

With 55,094 in the target population (see 6.1.2), $277,668 ÷ 55,094 = $5 per low-income Spanish-speaking person over 18.

6.1.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$277,668 ÷ 2,096 = $132 per enrollee.

6.1.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$277,668 ÷ 1,664 = $167 per low-income enrollee.

6.1.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$277,668 ÷ 3,065 = $91 per contact.

6.1.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	1,021	low-income contacts (estimated)[14]
PY II	567	low-income contacts (estimated)[14]
PY III	896	low-income contacts
Total	2,484	low-income contacts (estimated)[14]

$277,668 ÷ 2,484 = $112 per low-income contact.

---

[13] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III = (82%).*

[14] *Based on percent low-income served by center in PY III (81%)*

6.1.13 Retention/Follow-up. Albuquerque has one counselor responsible for following up center enrollees. Without guidelines from LNESC headquarters, the counselor is developing follow-up procedures. Although headquarters no longer requests the names of students who are enrolled, the Albuquerque follow-up counselor keeps such a list; in addition, she has reconstructed a list of all former enrollees, eliminating duplications. Each enrollee is assigned a number which appears on the file label beside the student's name. Such a numbering system allows the center to know at any point exactly how many enrollees they have assisted.

6.1.13.1 Follow-up is facilitated by the following mechanisms in the Albuquerque LNESC:

6.1.13.2 (a) Students are specifically informed that center services do not end at enrollment. In addition, they are referred to specific persons and supportive services available in the college.

6.1.13.3 (b) Students provide the center a work phone number, a residence phone number and the number at their parents' residence. In addition, references listed on BEOG forms provide additional contacts for the student.

6.1.13.4 (c) The follow-up counselor coordinates with the counselors in October each year to verify college enrollment for LNESC students.

6.1.13.5 Contact is made initially by phone. If the student can't be reached by phone, a letter with an enclosed postage paid card is mailed to the student. This procedure results in a 40 to 45% response from enrollees. Appendix IV shows a sample of the card.

6.1.13.6 Since students frequently change addresses, over half the students cannot be reached by phone or mail after they are enrolled. Therefore, the center compiles a list for each college and university of the students from whom it has received no response to follow-up efforts. In each student's file is a signed release form authorizing the Albuquerque LNESC center to collect information from the school concerning his enrollment, financial aid, etc.

6.1.13.7 (d) For students who do not respond to phone/mail follow-up and who do not appear on college rolls, counselors must rely on community contacts, or perhaps the return of the enrollee to the center services, for complete retention data.

6.1.13.8 Of eight students who responded to the student questionnaire, five are still enrolled. Two of the eight have finished their program, one a four-year degree, the other a graduate degree. Half the students said that they had not had contact with the center since they had enrolled in school. The other half had been contacted once or twice. Three students felt that the follow-up support services had been helpful in keeping them in school, while five felt the follow-up support services had not been helpful.

6.1.14 Feedback from students. Of 63 questionnaires sent to students, we received 8 responses. (See Appendix III for full description of student responses.) At that time of their first contact with the Albuquerque Center, four of the students were seniors in high school, one was an unemployed drop-out from high school, another a college drop-out, and two were already enrolled in college. Neither of the students already enrolled in college at the time of their first contact felt that the center services had helped them in getting into or staying in school. Half the students claimed their initial services included financial aid information; one student received career and education counselling, two received admissions information as well as help in filling out admission forms. One student claimed no services were provided. Three of the students felt the services they had received had helped them get into college while five claimed the services had not helped.

6.1.14.1 All of the students specified that financial difficulty was one of the major problems students faced in getting into school and staying in school. Two students felt the center's help with financial aid was the best thing it did to help students overcome these difficulties.

6.1.15 Role of Advisory Group. Albuquerque's Advisory Group members are selected from counselor's recommendations. The Advisory Group is composed of clients, representatives from universities and high school, professionals and government workers. The Advisory Group oversees the center operation, provides summer intern positions (employment), refers students to center services and provides scholarship campaigns, video/media help.

6.1.16 Feedback from community. Three community organizations and a CAA reported on their dealings with the Albuquerque LNESC and their estimation of the center's role in the community. All organizations felt the center's services were well-known to the Spanish-speaking community and that persons helped by the center felt very positively about the assistance they received. A spokesman at the CAA in Albuquerque reported that they were aware of LNESC but had had no specific contact with them.

6.1.16.1 The Albuquerque LNESC conducts interagency staff seminars every other week. The seminars acquaint staff members with services and contact people in the community. In addition, it familiarizes people in other agencies with LNESC, and thus generates referrals to the center.

6.2 BOSTON

6.2.1 Area. Appendix II shows the counties in Eastern Massachusetts now served by the Cambridge LNESC. Because the activities of the center for the first three program years were focussed on assisting Hispanic students from the southwest to enroll in Ivy League schools, rather than assisting the Hispanic population in Boston and its surroundings, the city of Boston with its large population of Hispanics (mostly Puerto Ricans) is now served by HEW's Talent Search program. The Boston LNESC center will now be serving six counties of eastern Massachusetts, an area of about 4,400 square miles.

6.2.1.1 *Center director's comment:* "It is incorrect to assume that we cannot work in the city of Boston because they have a Talent Search. The city has other agencies as well that do similar/related work and all of us combined are making only a small dent in turning the tide for minority students here. There are more than 7,000 Hispanic students in Boston (a conservative figure) and this does not include the statistics for our Black population which is significantly larger."

6.2.2 Target population. The six-county target area includes 7,466 low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over 18, according to census data, a conservative estimate. *Center director's comment:* "At a recent meeting of state agencies, it was stated that the present Hispanic population in the state is circa 250,000. Roughly 60% of these reside in the northeast part of the state (i.e. Greater Boston area, etc.)."

6.2.3 Location. The Boston LNESC is actually located in Cambridge, at 2 Sacramento Street, near Harvard University. The present director, who desires to focus the activity of this center on serving the Hispanic population of eastern Massachusetts, plans to move the center to a central location with more visibility to the Spanish-speaking community. *Center director's comment:* "The Boston Center has already relocated to Jamaica Plain in Boston proper. Jamaica Plain is estimated to have the largest Hispanic population in the city."

6.2.4 Staff. As of May 1977, the center staff consisted of a director, a secretary, two counselors and part-time work study student. All the staff are bilinqual, and their funding is currently all from CSA. A training position funded by CETA has expired and not been refilled. *Center director's comment:* "An additional permanent/full-time counselor has been allocated and filled in our center. This was to replace the vacant CETA position."

6.2.5 Caseload. The counselors counsel two to five students each week. Each counselor handles a caseload of 60 (about 40 new students and 20 ongoing students) at a time.

6.2.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population. Because the focus of the Boston LNESC activities for the first three program years was on students from the southwest, rather than from the area surrounding Boston, figures for those years are not logically related to the current target population around Boston; however, to give some idea of comparability, the following analyses parallel those we applied to the other LNESC centers.

PY I	0	low-income enrollments
PY II	59	low-income enrollments (estimated)[15]
PY III	108	low-income enrollments
Total	167	low-income enrollments (estimated)[15]

167 ÷ 7,466 = 3.24% of target population enrolled.

6.2.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$39,403	$5,879	$ 45,282
PY II	40,529	3,416	43,945
PY III	54,100	1,081	55,181
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$144,408
CETA	2,149	Subtotal--CETA	2,149
		TOTAL	$146,557

6.2.8 Expenditure per target population.

$146,557 ÷ 7,466 = $20 per person in the target population.

---

[15] *Based on percent low-income enrollments for PY III (86%).*

6.2.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$146,557 ÷ 214 = $685 per enrollee.

6.2.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$146,557 ÷ 167 = #878 per low-income enrollee.

6.2.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$146,557 ÷ 1,490 = $98 per contact[16]

6.2.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	328	low-income contacts (estimated)[17]
PY II	506	low-income contacts (estimated)[17]
PY III	480	low-income contacts
Total	1,316	low-income contacts (estimated)[17]

$146,557 ÷ 1,316 = $111 per low-income contact.

6.2.13 Retention/Follow-up. According to the Cambridge counselors, 80 percent of the students contacted by the center were from the southwest. Therefore, communication was by phone and no actual face-to-face counselling took place. Thus, the enrollees assisted were "more ideal clients;" i.e., students who had done well in high school. The current follow-up plan is to compile lists of enrolled students and check with the schools at the beginning and end of each academic year to confirm enrollment and financial aid status. They expect to provide supportive counselling to drop-outs and those with difficulties. Along with the change in focus to serving students from the Boston area will come a change toward encouraging students to enroll in state colleges, which are less expensive to attend than Ivy League schools.

6.2.13.1 Three students enrolled by Boston repsonded to the student questionnaire; all three are still enrolled. One has had no contact with the center since enrollment, one has been contacted once or twice, and the third, a client of the Corpus Christi Center as well as Boston, has had more than four contacts with LNESC since enrollment. The first two of these students were provided no follow-up supportive services, the other received academic/career counselling and was referred for financial aid or employment. The latter feels he could not have remained in school without this help.

---

[16] *Most, if not all, these contacts were from outside the current Boston target area.*

[17] *Based on percent low-income served by the center in PY III (86%).*

6.2.14 Feedback from students. Eight questionnaires were sent to students whom Boston reported as enrollees (3% of the list plus 2 extra); three were returned. One student's primary contact had been in Corpus Christi, Texas, but had contact with the Cambridge LNESC as well. Two other students had been contacted by LNESC: neither of these felt that the initial services had helped them get into school. See Appendix III for a complete description of students' responses to the questionnaire.

6.2.15 Role of Advisory Group. Boston has no Advisory Group; there is no LULAC council in the area. The Boston LNESC does have a Scholarship Committee which was promised from $800 to $1,000 in matching funds from the LULAC National Scholarship Fund. (*Note: $6,000 in LULAC National Scholarship Funds have been allocated to Massachusetts.*) The members of the Scholarship Committee include representatives of UMASS at Amherst, UMASS at Boston, HOPE's Talent Search, The Cardinal Cushing Center, and junior colleges in the state.

6.2.16 Feedback from community. Because the focus of center during the first three years was not the Boston area, and because the first two directors were Mexican-American, LNESC was seen by the predominantly Puerto Rican Hispanic Community as Mexicans working with Mexicans. As a result, little assistance or support was generated in the community. Now however, the director is working with a Hispanic coalition in Massachusetts to form a governor's task force on Hispanics.

6.2.16.1 Two community organizations and a CAA were asked their opinion of the current activities of the Boston LNESC. Both organizations felt the center's services were known to the Spanish-speaking community, but one indicated that more outreach would increase the community's recognition that services are now provided to all Hispanics in the target area. One organization spokesman recounted the experience of someone she knew personally, a very bright Puerto Rican who requested services, was turned away, and is now working and very discouraged from continuing his education. She added that since the present director has begun working with the Boston community, she feels optimistic about how the center can help the community. CAA staff in Cambridge reported that they were not aware of the LNESC center in Cambridge.

6.2.16.2 *Center director's comment:* "Extensive work has been done to combat initial negative impact and we believe the tide has turned. The statewide advisory task force to the Governor has been realized. Our center is now working on becoming a viable representative/technical assistant to this Advisory Council on issues concerning the education of Hispanics in the state."

6.3 CHICAGO

6.3.1 Area. The Chicago LNESC serves Cook County, an area of 1,920 square miles.

6.3.2 Target population. Thirty-six thousand three-hundred forty-four persons are Spanish-speaking, low-income and over the age of 18.

6.3.3 Location. There are three areas of Hispanic concentration in Chicago. The LNESC office operates in South Lawndale/Little Village, about 31.9% Spanish-speaking. In addition it operates satellite offices in both of Chicago's other areas of high Spanish-speaking concentration: one in Casa Central, 2635 North Kedzie Ave.; the other in Proyecto Venceremos, 8800 South Commercial. The main office is at 4054 1/2 West 26th Street.

6.3.4 Staff. In May 1977, the center had a director, a secretary and three counselors, all paid by CSA funds. No CETA or work-study staff can be hired because the office space is too small to accommodate them. All the present staff are bilingual and full-time.

6.3.4.1 According to the national director, Chicago's office space in 1,138 sq. feet, but it seemed to the evaluators to be the smallest of five offices visited. The crowded conditions, with no partitions between the business and counselling parts of the office, is a source of potential embarrassment for students who need to discuss financial or personal problems. For the same reason, the center cannot house additional staff, even though the size of the target population would justify additional counselors or clerical aid. Chicago paid $328/mo. for space in PY III, but the staff claim that a larger facility would cost about $650/mo., which is about what they paid in PY I and PY II.

6.3.5 Caseload. Counselors see about 15 students per week, about half new students and half ongoing. In the course of the year, a counselor is expected to serve about 400 students, half of which will be enrolled.

6.3.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	75	low-income enrollees
PY II	186	low-income enrollees (estimated)[18]
PY III	315	low-income enrollees
Total	576	low-income enrollees (estimated)[18]

576 ÷ 36,344 = 1.58% of target population enrolled.

6.3.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$116,305	$12,271	$128,576
PY II	68,310	6,955	75,265
PY III	62,682	35	62,717
All years	-	TOTAL--CSA	$266,558

6.3.7.1 For Program Year I, Chicago had the highest average expenditure for phone bills, space cost, equipment, and printing (see Table 6). In PY II and III (with a new director) the expenditures have fallen close to or below the average for all centers.

6.3.8 Expenditure per target population.

$266,558 ÷ 36,344 = $7 per person in the target population.

6.3.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$266,558 ÷ 684 = $390 per enrollee.

6.3.10 Expenditure per enrollee (low-income).

$266,558 ÷ 576 = $463 per low-income enrollee.

6.3.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$266,558 ÷ 3,280 = $81 per contact (total).

---

[18] *Based on percent low-income served by center in PY III (90%)*

6.3.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	976	low-income contacts (estimated)[19]
PY II	1,217	low-income contacts (estimated)[19]
PY III	886	low-income contacts
Total	3,079	low-income contacts (estimated)[19]

$266,558 : 3,079 = $87 per low-income contact.

6.3.13 Retention/Follow-up. Counselors have attempted each summer to contact by phone the students they had enrolled. They are able to contact most students, and most are still enrolled. Both students who replied to our student questionnaire are still enrolled.

6.3.13.1 A follow-up form letter with a self-addressed return card is mailed to students who cannot be reached by phone. About 10% return is received on the follow-up letters. As in other centers, however, no narrative or numerical report is made on the numbers of students the counselors attempted to reach, and the number reached, and the number enrolled. The center needs a release form signed by the student (as Albuquerque has, see 6.1) so that colleges can tell LNESC counselors about enrollment, amount of financial aid, etc. About half of the students whom they helped enroll return for help in reapplication for financial aid or transfer to another school. For other problems, counselors refer students to other agencies. Counselors make contacts within the colleges and universities by attending conferences and seminars (for instance with financial aid officers). The colleges in which 90% of LNESC students enroll operated several special programs. However, the counselors said it would be good to have an additional counselor assigned to follow-up and retention.

6.3.14 Feedback from students. Of 20 questionnaires that were sent to enrollees of Chicago LNESC, two were returned. Both students felt positive about the initial and follow-up services they had received. One learned about the center services from friends and another from a center counselor who came to their high school. Both students were out of high school when they received help from the center. One student has received monthly contact before and after enrollment at the State University. (See Appendix III for complete questionnaire responses.)

6.3.15 Role of Advisory Group. LULAC is not an active organization in Illinois, with only nine councils (100 members total). Members of LULAC in Illinois tend to be Mexican-Americans from the Southwest. They do not seem interested in recruiting or expanding their membership amoung the other Hispanic persons in the Chicago area (of whom there are thousands). The LULAC state director reportedly stated that "Too many non-Mexican-Americans are being served by the program," and therefore withdrew her support.

---

[19] *Based on percent low-income served by center in PY III (94%)*

6.3.15.1 Because of this, the Advisory Group, appointed by the LULAC state director has not been much support to the Chicago center. Although the Advisory Group has met 2-3 times since January 1977, attendance varies from meeting to meeting and is not representative of the schools and community the center serves.

6.3.16 Feedback from community. Two community organizations and a CAA provided information on their relationship to the Chicago LNESC, and what their reading was of how the community is served by the center. Both organizations feel the centers' services are well-known to the Spanish-speaking community and that persons assisted by the center appreciated the help and had confidence in the staff who provided it. They suggest that the need for such services is greater than the present facilities and staff of the center can meet.

6.3.16.1 The spokesman at the CAA reported that the agency has had contact with center staff, and that the community does seem to know about and have a positive opinion of the Chicago LNESC. He told us that a study of Chicago Latino organizations, done at Northwestern University, showed the center to have "a fairly good track record."

6.4 COLORADO SPRINGS

6.4.1 Area. The Colorado Springs LNESC serves eight counties in an area of approximately 22,850 miles. The center regularly services 7 high schools in the Colorado Springs area and 12 in other areas.

6.4.2 Target population. Colorado Springs serves 12,794 Spanish-speaking persons over the age of 18 who are low-income.

6.4.3 Location. 334 East Colorado Ave., Colorado Springs, Colorado 80903. February 1976 CSA field visit report states that the center is located in an area of easy access for low-income Spanish-speaking students; however, 95% of work is outreach and 5% walk-ins.

6.4.4 Staff. In March 1977, the center employed a director, two secretaries, three counselors and a college work study student. All but the last are full-time. Colorado Springs has received $17,127 in CETA funds for personnel.

6.4.5 Caseload. The number of contacts per counselor averaged 354/year with 160 enrollments. Almost 30 new contacts per month are made by each counselor.

6.4.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	502	low-income enrollments (estimated)[20]
PY II	423	low-income enrollments (estimated)[20]
PY III	407	low-income enrollments
Total	1,332	low-income enrollments (estimated)[20]

1,332 ÷ 12,794 = 10/41% of target population enrolled (highest of any center).[21]

6.4.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$135,480	$4,624	$140,104
PY II	81,137	853	81,990
PY III	84,752	2,323	87,075
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$309,169
CETA	17,127	Subtotal--CETA	17,127
		TOTAL	$326,296

6.4.8 Expenditure per target population.

$326,296 ÷ 12,794 = $26 per person in the target population.

6.4.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).[21]

$326,296 ÷ 1,607 = $203 per enrollee.

---

[21] *11% of enrollees (total) were counted more than once because of transfer to new schools or re-enrollments. It is impossible to judge how many of those enrollees who were double counted were low-income, thus no accurate estimate of percent enrollment is possible.*

[20] *Based on percent low-income served by center in PY III (85%).*

6.4.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.[21]

$326,296 ÷ 1,332 = $245 per low-income enrollee.

6.4.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$326,296 ÷ 3,455 = $94 per contact.

6.4.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	1,118	low-income contacts (estimated)[22]
PY II	880	low-income contacts (estimated)[22]
PY III	841	low-income contacts
Total	2,839	low-income contacts (estimated)[22]

$326,296 ÷ 2,839 = $115 per low-income contact.

6.4.13 Retention/Follow-up. Colorado Springs is currently performing a study to find out the current status of their enrollees. They are compiling a list of all the students they have enrolled, and have contacted school officials who will check the list to see if the students are enrolled. They are being assisted by the Colorado Education Service for the Disadvantaged Association (CESDA)--an association of the state's minority counselors, to which the center belongs.

6.4.13.1 Of eight students who responded to the LNESC questionnaire, five are still in school and one has graduated. Two have dropped out. Five students have received services since they have been in school, three have not. Most of the follow-up support serivces were in the area of financial aid; six students found the support service helpful, two did not.

6.4.14 Feedback from students. Of 48 questionnaires mailed to enrollees from Colorado Springs, 36 were delivered, and 8 responses were received in our office. Three students received initial career and educational counselling, six received admissions assistance, and seven received financial aid assistance. Two received introduction to people who could help them in school. All the students felt that the initial services they had received had helped them get into school. Two students had first heard about LNESC from their high school counselors; two when someone from the center came to their high school; three had heard about it from relatives and friends; and one claimed that he had never heard about it. For complete description of student feedback, see Appendix III.

---

[22] *Based on percent low-income served by center in PY III (74%).*

6.4.15 Feedback from community. Two community agencies provided information about the Colorado Springs LNESC. Both organizations had worked with the center regarding financial aid opportunities for students. Spokesmen from the organizations felt positively about the services which the center is providing, although both felt the center needs more exposure (advertisement and community involvement) to make people more aware of the services provided. The center director noted that they do use numerous PSAs in both English and Spanish-speaking communications media. One spokesman said there had been some problems with staff, but added that since the great staff turnover last year they seem to be taking new directions.

6.5 CORPUS CHRISTI

6.5.1 Area. Corpus Christi serves 12 counties in southeastern Texas, an area of about 17,080 square miles.

6.5.2 Target population. Fifty-six thousand five-hundred ten persons are Spanish-speaking, low-income, and over 18.

6.5.3 Location. 702 Morgan Avenue, Corpus Christi, TX 78404. The center occupies a two-story house in the center of Corpus Christi. Counselors travel up to 80 miles to serve the target population. One outpost is in a low-income housing project.

6.5.4 Staff. Corpus Christi has a large staff.

Job Title	Hours per week	Spanish speaking	Funding
Director	40	yes	CSA
Secretary	40	yes	CSA
Coll. Place. Counselor	40	yes	CSA
Coll. Place. Counselor	40	no	CSA
Coll. Place. Counselor	40	yes	CSA
Coll. Place. Counselor	40	yes	CSA
Coll. Place. Counselor	40	yes	CETA, Title VI
Career Counselor	40	yes	CETA, Title I
Career Counselor	40	no	CETA, Title I
Career Counselor	40	yes	CETA, Title I
MIS Clerk	40	---	CETA, Title VI
Receptionist/Clerk	15	---	Youth Serv. Prog.
Clerk Typist	12	---	Work-study
Volunteer Counselor	10	yes	Volunteer

6.5.5 Caseload. Each CSA-funded counselor serves about 36 students per week and works with an average caseload of 258 new and ongoing students. Three counselors paid by CETA do the career counselling. This frees the CSA-funded counselors to work with college placement and financial aid only. In most of the other centers CSA counselors provide all functions. CETA also funds the MIS Clerk who is responsible for filing, up-dating, follow-up, and statistical reporting, freeing counselors from those tasks as well. (See Appendix IV for a sample of this center's alphabetically-filed duplicate student record, used by the MIS Clerk for data analysis/reporting and follow-up.)

6.5.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	533	low-income enrollees
PY II	407	low-income enrollees (estimated)[23]
PY III	500	low-income enrollees
Total	1,440	low-income enrollees (estimated)[23]

1,400 56,510 = 2.55% of target population enrolled.

6.5.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$149,554	$4,107	$153,661
PY II	81,921	1,097	83,018
PY III	102,826	1,632	104,458
All Years		Subtotal--CSA	$341,137
CETA	24,635	Subtotal--CETA	24,635[24]
		TOTAL	$365,772

6.5.8 Expenditure per target population.

$365,772 ÷ 47,789 = $8 per person in the target population.

---

[23] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (44%).*

[24] *Total from outside sources through September 30, 1976, but not including $44,236 from CETA Title I, which has been devoted to career counselling; these counsellees were not included in Corpus Christi MIS reports.*

6.5.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$365,772 ÷ 2,949 = $124 per enrollees.

6.5.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$365,772 ÷ 1,440 = $254 per low-income enrollee.

6.5.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$365,772 ÷ 4,417 = $83 per contact.

6.5.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	828	low-income contacts (estimated)[25]
PY II	531	low-income contacts (estimated)[25]
PY III	736	low-income contacts
Total	2,115	low-income contacts (estimated)[25]

$365,772 ÷ 2,115 = $173 per low-income contact.

6.5.13 Retention/Follow-up. Once each year (in the summer) the MIS Clerk provides an alphabetical list of the students enrolled up to that year. Students are phoned by a work-study student to see if they are enrolled or to see if they have any problems. The center gets a fair response from the phone calls and can set up appointments for follow-up/retention services. Last year's summer phone-out was incomplete.

6.5.13.1 For other students, the work-study summer helper has mailed cards in the fall asking whether students are enrolled in school, whether they have financial aid (how much), and in what program they are enrolled. In addition, the career placement CETA workers do home visits and attempt to contact past enrollees in the communities they visit. The center also gets feedback when a student returns to LNESC.

6.5.13.2 The center has contacts in the financial aid and admission offices at Delmar College who help with the list of enrollees who cannot be tracked down in other ways. The University of Texas provides a computer printout of the students' status.

6.5.13.3 The center prepares a written report on the summer work-study retention study. In addition, the MIS Clerk updates the alphabetical duplicate file on each student whenever contact is made; thus, the duplicate file could provide material for a statistical retention study.

---

[25] *Based on percent low-income contacted by center in PY III (48%).*

6.5.13.4 In October all counselors make a field trip to the University of Texas at Austin where they meet college staff and become acquainted with support personnel.

6.5.13.5 Of 19 students who responded to the student questionnaire, 12 were still enrolled in school, five were not, and two did not answer. The students have received the following support services:

3 academic and career counselling;
1 personal and family counselling;
2 referral to tutoring;
1 legal aid;
3 financial aid/employment counselling; and
7 referral for financial aid/employment counselling.

One student claimed he had received no support services and seven did not answer. Ten students felt that the support services they had received had been helpful while four felt they did not help in staying in school, and five did not answer.

6.5.14 Feedback from students. Questionnaires were sent to 88 Corpus Christi enrollees. Seventy-nine were delivered and 19 were completed and returned. The most frequent services provided to help students to enroll in school were:

Filling out aid forms (18);
Providing financial aid information (15);
Filling out admissions forms (12);
Providing admission information (10); and
Career/educational counselling (6).

Only three of the 19 responding students felt that the services had not helped at all in their enrolling in school. (See Appendix III for full description of the student questionnaire responses.)

6.5.15 Role of Advisory Group. The ten-member Corpus Christi LNESC Advisory Group is made up of one-third parents, one-third community representatives, and one-third college or education representatives. LULAC membership is not required. The group meets every one or two months at the center. The Advisory Group is limited in authority, advisory in nature, and performs public relations (i.e., contacts with political figures and additional funding sources).

6.5.16 Feedback from community. A spokesman for a Corpus Christi social service agency told us about how the community sees the local LNESC. Frequent interaction between the center and his agency has provided helpful outcomes in career counselling and guidance. The Spanish-speaking community was said to be well acquainted with LNESC services through the center's literature and public service announcements. Those served by the center feel it is "very helpful." The community person felt the extensive area covered by LNESC in Corpus Christi warranted more funding.

6.5.16.1 A similar report was given by the Corpus Christi CAA, which has developed a cooperative relationship with the center. The spokesman had a positive opinion of LNESC, and told us that the community shared this opinion. She suggested that the center should expand.

6.6 HOUSTON

6.6.1 Area. The Houston LNESC serves eight counties, approximately 12,320 square miles.

6.6.2 Target population. 1970 census figures show 37,149 Spanish-speaking, low-income persons over 18 years of age in the 8 counties served. (See Appendix II).

6.6.3 Location. A 1976 regional evaluation of the Houston center stated that the location, 1416 Broadway in Houston, Texas was in an area of easy access for low-income Hispanic students. A LNESC publication, "Building Leadership through Education," shows the center to be housed in a two-story residence.

6.6.4 Staff. In March 1977, the center employed a director, four counselors, and one typist full-time. They also employed two neighborhood youth students and one graduate student, all part-time (16 hours each), but not paid from the CSA grant.

6.6.4.1 Exxon USA has donated over $12,000 in personnel costs to the Houston LNESC. The center also has CETA-funded employees.

6.6.5 Caseload. Between December 1973 and October 1976, the Houston center reported 9,959 students contacted, an average of 64 new contacts per counselor per month. We calculate an annual caseload per counselor of 766 persons, an extraordinarily high number. Most of the contacts were in a 10-month period, averaging eight new contacts per counselor each day (6,606 new contacts for the center 12-1-74 through 9-30-75).

6.6.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	455	low-income enrollees
PY II	380	low-income enrollees (estimated)[26]
PY III	443	low-income enrollees
Total	1,278	low-income enrollees (estimated)[26]

37,149 ÷ 1,278 = 3.44% of target population enrolled.

6.6.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$143,030	$12,521	$155,551
PY II	79,210	2,404	81,614
PY III	88,091	2,794	90,885
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$328,050
Exxon	12,200	Subtotal--Exxon	12,200
		TOTAL	$340,250

6.6.8 Expenditures per target population.

$340,250 ÷ 37,149 = $9 per person in the target population.

6.6.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$340,250 ÷ 2,196 = $155 per enrollee.

6.6.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$340,250 ÷ 1,278 = $266 per low-income enrollee.

6.6.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$340,250 ÷ 9,959 = $34 per contact.

6.6.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	963	low-income contacts (estimated)[27]
PY II	3,369	low-income contacts (estimated)[27]
PY III	753	low-income contacts
Total	5,085	low-income contacts (estimated)[27]

---

[26] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (52%)*

[27] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (51%)*

6.6.13 Retention/Follow-up. Houston's retention/follow-up efforts were very similar to those of other centers:

6.6.13.1 "The first year it was easy. We just called them up. But there are so many now. We can put out a mailing and the ones who don't send it back, we call up and try to track them down; if we can't find them we just don't know if they are still enrolled or not. Also, in the beginning we didn't always write their names down. We try getting the information from schools but they don't like to give us a printout. Now we have a friend at the university who is going to let me copy her printout when she gets it." (Paraphrase of center response to phone questionnaire.)

6.6.13.2 Like many centers, the Houston center does not feel it has funds to provide special support services (such as tutoring, legal aid, housing, etc.), but they refer students in need to appropriate school services or social service agencies. They make efforts to insure that free services, such as tutoring, will be available. For minor personal problems, LNESC counselors may try to help; if problems are serious, the student can be referred to a social service agency which charges according to income.

6.6.13.3 Of the six students who replied to the student questionnaire, all are still enrolled. Three students received follow-up supportive services; three had contact with the center two or more times after enrollment. All the follow-up supportive services involved financial aid or employment. Two of the students felt that the follow-up services were quite helpful, while four (including three students who had received no follow-up services) felt the center had not helped them stay in school.

6.6.14 Feedback from students. Of 65 questionnaires mailed out, 52 were delivered and 6 were returned completed, to our office. Four of the students learned about LNESC first through their high school and one learned about it when a speaker sponsored by the center appeared at the college he was attending. Three of the students were in high school, one graduated from high school, one in college and another a college drop-out when they first heard of LNESC services. Four of the students had no contact with the center before they had enrolled in college, while two had four or more contacts with the center before enrollment. Financial aid, helping filling out financial application forms, and active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid were the services most frequently provided before enrollment. Three of the students felt the services helped them get into school, three of them did not.

6.6.15 Role of Advisory Group. The Houston LNESC Advisory Committee has fifteen members: five community representatives, three educators, three students, one parent and three LULAC members. Meetings are held quarterly. The center has given seminars at the LULAC district convention and the council has worked with the center on scholarships locally and nationally. The center participates in Career Days, sponsored by LULAC, and in social and fund-raising LULAC events.

6.6.16 Feedback from community. Both community organizations we contacted about the Houston LNESC were positive about the center. Agency people felt that the center was well-known in the Spanish-speaking community and that those who have used the center's services felt they were very good. They found the center very cooperative with community agencies but felt the center could usefully extend its services with more funding. When we contacted the CAA, however, the spokesman there told us he felt that more outreach and PR would be useful to make the center adequately known in the Spanish-speaking community.

6.7 PHOENIX

6.7.1 Area. Phoenix serves three counties in Arizona, an estimated 60,800 square miles.

6.7.2 Target population. Phoenix serves 39,973 low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over the age of 18.

6.7.3 Location. 1001 North Central Avenue, Phoenix, AZ 85004.

6.7.4 Staff. As of March 1977, the Phoenix LNESC operated with a director, a secretary, four education counselors, one of whom focusses on outreach counselling (all of these full-time), and three CEC students (each of whom works eight hours a week).

6.7.5 Caseload. The Phoenix center reported 6,102 total contacts for the 40 months of its first three program years. This averages 38 new contacts per month, per counselor. This means 458 contacts per counselor per year, a very heavy caseload.

6.7.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	655	low-income enrollees
PY II	662	low-income enrollees (estimated)[28]
PY III	427	low-income enrollees
Total	1,744	low-income enrollees (estimated)[28]

1,744 ÷ 37,923 = 4.37% of target population enrolled.

6.7.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$140,557	$11,727	$152,284
PY II	73,644	2,458	76,102
PY III	76,052	762	76,814
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$305,200
CETA	9,355	Subtotal--CETA	9,355
		TOTAL	$314,555

6.7.8 Expenditure per target population.

$314,555 ÷ 39,923 = $8 per person in the target population.

6.7.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$314,555 ÷ 2,489 = $126 per enrollee.

6.7.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$314,555 ÷ 1,744 = $180 per low-income enrollee.

6.7.11 Expenditure per low-income contact (total).

$314,555 ÷ 6,102 = $52 per contact.

6.7.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	2,183	low-income contacts (estimated)[29]
PY II	835	low-income contacts (estimated)[29]
PY III	1,200	low-income contacts
Total	4,218	low-income contacts (estimated)[29]

---

[28] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (65%).*

[29] *Based on percent low-income contacted by center in PY III (69%).*

$314,555 : 4,318 = $75 per low-income contact.

6.7.13 Retention/Follow-up. Phoenix's retention/follow-up services include sending a letter to students asking how they are doing and enclosing return postcards. They then try to call nonresponders. Their problems include student transience, and limited staff whose present work load does not allow them to spend any more time than this.

6.7.13.1 Support services the center provides are basically referrals. Counselors have established good relations with the various college services (tutorial, etc.) and groups such as MECHA, which is active in both the universities and high schools of Arizona. The center tries to acquaint each student with supportive services available and whom to contact, especially when a particular problem is identified. Many students return to the center after enrollment for help in submitting financial aid forms again, but the center staff attempts to assist students to become independent by referring them to the colleges' financial aid offices.

6.7.13.2 Of five students who responded to the student questionnaire, three are still enrolled, one is not, and one has graduated. Two of the students received no contact with the center after enrollment, while three have been contacted at least twice. Those students were referred to academic/career counselling, personal and family counselling, and financial aid or employment. Two of the students felt that the supportive follow-up services they had received had helped them stay in school while three said that they had not helped, including two students who said they had received no follow-up services. *Center director's comment:* "This year we have undertaken to contact all PY III enrollments. The project has proved to be quite successful in helping us find out how many of our clients are still enrolled. PY I and PY II had no such efforts. It is easy to see why a former client would tend to offer negative responses if he has not heard from the Center since 1973 and then receives survey questionnaire in 1977."

6.7.14 Feedback from students. Five students returned completed questionnaires (out of 75 mailed out, 61 delivered). Two students were in high schools when they first contacted the center, one had graduated, and one was a college drop-out. Two students had not had contact with LNESC before they were enrolled in college, while three had 1 to 5 contacts with the center before enrollment. Two had received help in filling out admission forms, and four had received information about financial aid and help filling out financial aid application forms. Two students felt that the initial services helped a great deal in getting into school, while three felt the services were not much help. (Two questionnaires that were returned noted that this was the first time the students had heard of the Phoenix LNESC. This is quite surprising since the names and addresses of students to whom questionnaires were mailed came from the center's list of enrollees.) Complete student responses are in Appendix III.

6.7.15 Role of Advisory Group. Unknown. However, center staff members attend the LULAC state convention and has helped the 22 or 23 LULAC councils in the state to set up their scholarship funds. *Center director's comment:* "Over the past year, the Advisory Committee has been reactivated, and the members have displayed great interest in the operations and success of the center."

6.7.16 Feedback from community. Two community organizations were contacted for information on the role of LNESC in their community. One agency stated that while they used to have a relationship with the Phoenix center they did no longer. No reason was given. *Center director's comment:* "In the past the Center had made numerous commitments to local agencies to have our counselors at their sites. When I assumed the directorship, I discontinued weekly visits to a number of these agencies where we were getting negligible results and put them on a referral call basis."

6.7.16.1 The other agency has worked closely with LNESC in setting up a satellite office. They noted that the center was not well-known in the community because some of the students who are as far as twenty miles from the center don't have any way of knowing what services are provided. However, the agency spokesperson felt that the students who have been helped feel positively about their interaction with LNESC. Our attempts to contact the Phoenix CAA were not successful.

6.7.16.2 The center relies on over 20 high schools and school districts, community colleges and social programs for referrals. All students who responded to our questionnaire had heard about the center first or through their high schools or were referred by friends. None had seen posters or other publicity and one said he had never heard of the LULAC National Education Service Center. *Center director's comment:* "In PY I and PY II, there was no great emphases on publicity outside of the areas of direct impact, i.e., the high schools, community colleges and universities. Recently our national office came out with posters and program brochures which we feel have been quite successful."

6.8 POMONA

6.8.1 Area. Pomona serves a four-county area in southern California of approximately 42,120 square miles.

6.8.2 Target population. The Pomona center serves 195,252 low-income Spanish-speaking persons over the age of 18, the largest target population of any LNESC.

6.8.3 Location. In January 1976, the center moved to 685 West Mission St., Pomona, CA. The center is located in an older, two-story private home of approximately 2,400 square feet which has been adequately remodeled for their use. It has private counselling rooms, a good arrangement for developing confidential information. The location is on a main thoroughfare and fairly easy to reach. (The preceding description is from the 1976 regional evaluation of the Pomona LNESC. However, a community agency told us that the center needed a better location.)

6.8.4 Staff. As of March 1977, the center operated with a field director, administrative secretary, five full-time counselors (one a supervisor), and one part-time counselor. Two of the counselors are funded from outside sources (CETA and WIN).

6.8.5 Caseload. In February 1976, the center had 3.5 counselors (the supervising counselor position was empty). As of March 1977, there are 5.5 counselors. At an average of 4.5 counselors for its first three program years, the center saw 84 new clients per month, or 19 per counselor each month. The estimated annual caseload would therefore be 223 for each counselor.

6.8.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	295	low-income enrollees (estimated)[30]
PY II	199	low-income enrollees
PY III	126	low-income enrollees
Total	620	low-income enrollees (estimated)[30]

620 ÷ 195,252 = 0.32% of target population enrolled.

---

[30] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY II (67%).*

6.8.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$112,946	$7,701	$120,647
PY II	60,031	1,400	61,431
PY III	78,333	1,616	79,949
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$262,027
CETA	12,100	Subtotal--CETA	12,100
		TOTAL	$274,127

6.8.8 Expenditure per target population.

$274,127 ÷ 185,252 = $1 per member of the target population.

6.8.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$274,127 ÷ 907 = $302 per enrollee.

6.8.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$274,127 ÷ 620 = $442 per low-income enrollee.

6.8.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$274,127 ÷ 3,015 = $91 per contact (total).

6.8.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	1,147	low-income contacts (estimated)[31]
PY II	646	low-income contacts
PY III	208	low-income contacts
Total	2,001	low-income contacts (estimated)[31]

$274,127 ÷ 2,001 = $138 per low-income contact.

6.8.13 Retention/Follow-up. The center does follow-up when they have time and manpower. For example, they have tried to call the students or get in touch with them through a friend; however, they have not done this recently. Usually the student comes back for help reapplying for financial aid, and that is how the center finds out what he is doing. Sometimes they learn about their enrollees through conversations with colleges and universities. However, they run into road blocks when they try to have college confirm enrollment on lists on students; the colleges claim they have no time to go through a whole list, and they do not allow center staff to come and look at their data.

---

[31] *Based on percent low-income contacted by center in PY II (67%).*

6.8.13.1 For follow-up services, the center staff make it a point to introduce students to EOP and other programs, and make sure that the staff of those program know who the LNESC enrollees are in order to help them.

6.8.13.2 Of nine students who responded to the questionnaire, six are still enrolled and three are not. Three students have not had contact with the center since they have been enrolled, while six have been contacted at least once. Two students said that they had been provided academic or career counselling; two, tutoring; two, financial aid or employment; and one social activities, after enrollment in college. Four students have received no follow-up support services. Five students felt that the follow-up supportive services they received from LNESC had helped a great deal in keeping them in school.

6.8.14 Feedback from students. Twenty-seven questionnaires were mailed out (of which 24 were delivered); nine students returned completed questionnaires. Five students had heard about the center first through their high school, three had been referred by friends, and one learned about the center through publicity. Six students were in high school or just graduated, one was a high school drop-out, and two were in college at their first contact with the center. Three students had no contact with the center before enrollment, while six had 1-4 contacts before they enrolled. The initial service most frequently provided was information about financial aid and help filling out financial aid application forms. Other initial services frequently mentioned were counselling about career and educational goals, information about admissions, and active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid.

6.8.14.1 Seven students felt that these services had helped them a great deal in getting them into school, one said that the services had helped some, but one felt the services had not helped him.

6.8.15 Role of Advisory Group. Unknown. However, all of the center staff belongs to the local LNESC council. They participate in local, district, and state LULAC projects, especially those aimed at youth and education.

Most of them also help with fund raising activities like selling tickets for the annual banquet. In addition, LULAC provides employment for high school students for the summer.

6.8.16 Feedback from community. Information was obtained from one community organization with whom the center had worked. In that agency spokesman's opinion, most of the people in the Spanish-speaking community know about LNESC services. However, he also suggested that more advertisement would help the community know where LNESC is located and what services provided. In general, the organization's feeling is that the center is doing "a fantastic job" and should expand.

6.8.16.1 The spokesman at the Los Angeles CAA told us that the Pomona LNESC is a delegate agency of the CAA. Although their last contact with the center was some time ago, the CAA feels that the community does know about the center and its services. The spokesman said he was "very impressed" with the center's outreach program to prisoners and ex-convicts, and their activity in community affairs and all educational areas.

6.9 SAN FRANCISCO

6.9.1 Area. The San Francisco LNESC serves two counties, and an area of approximately 1,080 square miles.

6.9.2 Target population. Fifteen-thousand six-hundred five low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over the age of 18 reside in the target area.

6.9.3 Location. 3004 16th St., Suite 208, San Francisco California. The center is located in the middle of the (predominantly Hispanic) Mission district of San Francisco. The building is centrally located close to public transportation, and offers plenty of meeting space. Walk-in's to the center are minimal; the head counselor is given the task of serving these people. The majority of client sessions take part in assigned schools.

6.9.4 Staff. As of April 1977, San Francisco LNESC staff included the director, a secretary, three counselors (all full-time) and one work-study student who performs clerical work.

6.9.5 Caseload. In the 36 months of operation before October 1976, 4,285 clients were seen. This is an average of 119 new contacts per month which, at the present staff level (3 counselors) equals 40 new contacts per counselor each month. The annual caseload per counselor would thus be 476 students.

6.9.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	487	low-income enrollees
PY II	219	low-income enrollees (estimated)[32]
PY III	216	low-income enrollees
Total	922	low-income enrollees (estimated)[32]

922 ÷ 15,605 = 5.91% of target population enrolled.

6.9.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$119,346	$3,289	$122,635
PY II	70,029	896	70,925
PY III	73,394	3,033	76,427
		TOTAL	$269,987

6.9.8 Expenditure per target population.

$269,987 ÷ 15,605 = $17 per person in the target population.

6.9.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$269,987 ÷ 1,502 = $180 per enrollee.

6.9.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$269,987 ÷ 922 = $293 per low-income enrollee.

6.9.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$269,987 ÷ 4,285 = $63 per contact.

6.9.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	1,096	low-income contacts (estimated)[33]
PY II	1,000	low-income contacts (estimated)[33]
PY III	520	low-income contacts
Total	2,616	low-income contacts (estimated)[33]

---

[32] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (50%).*

[33] *Based on percent low-income contacted by center in PY III (61%).*

6.9.13 Retention/Follow-up. The center director informed us that the center does not have sufficient staff to do any follow-up, except that general contact with the community does produce follow-up in an informal way. The center provides supportive follow-up services only as requested, therefore, students receiving these services are self-selected.

6.9.13.1 Of six students who replied to the questionnaire, four students were still enrolled, one was not, and one was graduated. Four students had contact with the center after enrollment, one had no contact since enrollment, and one did not answer this question. The sort of follow-up supportive services students described the center as providing after enrollment included academic or career counselling, personal or family counselling, and financial aid or employment. Two students were referred by the center for academic or career counselling, two for tutoring, two for financial aid or employment, and two for social activities. Four students said that the center's follow-up supportive services had helped them stay in school, while one felt that such services had not really been much help and one did not answer.

6.9.14 Feedback from students. Of 45 questionnaires mailed out (36 delivered), 6 were returned completed. Four students first learned about LNESC through their high school, two had learned about it from friends or other publicity. Two students had been in high school at the first contact, two had been graduated from high school but not enrolled in college. (Two did not answer this question.) Two students had no contact with the center before enrollment, and three had at least 3-4 contacts (one did not answer). The most frequently provided initial service was help filling out admission forms, followed by information about admissions. Three students each received counselling about career and educational goals, information about financial aid, help filling out financial aid forms, and active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid. Two students feel that they would not have gotten into school without this initial help; four felt the services had helped them somewhat. (See Appendix III for complete responses to the student questionnaire.)

6.9.15 Role of Advisory Group. Some members of the Advisory Group are nominated by the director; the LULAC director selects others. The Advisory Board theoretically has 15 members. However, the board meets infrequently and at the last meeting only four members of the board attended. The function of the Advisory Board is to provide the center some legitimacy, and present feedback from the community as to its needs.

6.9.15.1 Three of the center staff are on the LULAC council, two are officers and the third is the head of the Education Committee. The relationship between the LULAC National Education Services Center in San Francisco and the local LULAC council includes LULAC's contributing to the center's book fund, and the center providing workshops on bilingual education.

6.9.16 Feedback from community. Two community organizations provided feedback on the role of the San Francisco LNESC. Both agencies had had contact with the center. In their opinion, a majority of the people in the Spanish-speaking community know about the center's services. One organization did not know how the center clients felt about the services, the other felt that the people served felt positively about the services they had received. One organization felt that the LNESC services were okay, while the other was more postive and felt that the center was a very good resource for the community. The San Francisco CAA spokesman we talked to told us that bitter disagreement some time ago had ended their relationship with the center--but he was not certain that the program he was referring to was in fact LNESC.

6.10 SEATTLE

6.10.1 Area. The Seattle center currently serves eight counties in western Washington. In addition, a satellite office in Yakima serving Hispanics in the eastern part of the state was operated until December 1976. At that time Northwest Rural Opportunities began a Talent Search project there, and the Seattle LNESC entered into a cooperative arrangement, assisting Yakima students "with all the services we provide" when they apply to the many colleges and universities west of the mountains. The total area for all nine counties is 33,330 square miles.

6.10.2 Target population. The center served 6,860 low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over 18, in the three program years.

6.10.3 Location. The center is located at 4033 Stoneway North, in Seattle. It operates 12 satellite offices, in four counties, at Hispanic organizations, Indian centers, low-income housing projects, and a penitentiary--many of which have GED or ABE programs. The present location is the fourth for the center.

6.10.4 Staff. As of March 1977, the center staff included a director, one secretary, three counselors funded by CSA, two counselors' aides funded by CETA, (all full-time), and one part-time clerical assistant funded by Youth Work Training. Two of the counselors have been with the center only since January 1977.

6.10.5 Caseload. The counselors reported they meet an average of 15 students per week, and carry an average caseload of 132 students. Calculation of caseload from total contacts for the first three program years (36 months) estimate the average annual caseload per counselor to be 771.

6.10.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	260	low-income enrollees
PY II	79	low-income enrollees (estimated)[34]
PY III	150	low-income enrollees
Total	489	low-income enrollees (estimated)[34]

489 ÷ 6,860 = 7.13% of target population enrolled.

6.10.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$113,321	$8,046	$121,367
PY II	49,414	4,309	53,723
PY III	59,510	1,667	71,187
		TOTAL	$246,277

6.10.8 Expenditure per target population.

$246,277 ÷ 6,860 = $36 per person in the target population.

6.10.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$246,277 ÷ 605 = $409 per enrollee.

---

[34] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (69%).*

6.10.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$246,277 ÷ 489 = $504 per low-income enrollee.

6.10.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$246,277 ÷ 2,436 = $101 per contact.

6.10.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	758	low-income contacts (estimated)[35]
PY II	291	low-income contacts (estimated)[35]
PY III	581	low-income contacts
Total	1,630	low-income contacts (estimated)[35]

$246,277 ÷ 1,630 = $151 per low-income contact.

6.10.13 Retention/Follow-up. The center attempts to contact students they have enrolled once each quarter, but it is difficult to reach the students because they frequently have moved before enrollment is confirmed. (The EOP at the University of Washington has a 70% drop-out rate.)

6.10.13.1 Sometimes students return to the center for financial aid assistance. When this occurs, the student has access to his file for copies of his/her original financial aid forms, and receives assistance completing and submitting new forms. The counselors attempt to make the student independent after enrollment. However, they encourage students to call when they have problems and to use contacts in the college in which they are enrolled. Many of the students with whom this center works are incarcerated at the time of their first contact. The counselors can follow-up these students by working with half-way houses when the student is on "resident release."

6.10.13.2 The one student who responded to the student questionnaire is still enrolled. He has had no contact with the center since enrollment although he was referred to a source of financial aid or employment which helped some in staying in school.

6.10.14 Feedback from students. One student provided feedback about the Seattle LNESC. He had heard about the center when someone from the center came to his school.

---

[35] *Based on percent of low-income contacted by center in PY III (67%).*

Before enrolling in school, he had contact with the center 3-4 times. The initial services provided him were information about admissions and helping filling out forms, information about financial aid, help filling out financial aid application forms, and active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid. He felt that these initial services helped him some in getting into school.

6.10.15 Role of Advisory Group. The Advisory Group for the Seattle LNESC is composed of members of the state LULAC, representatives from Spanish-speaking organizations, from education, and from business. There were two vacancies on the board as of Spring 1977. Members are selected by the state director of LULAC from recommendations from the Seattle LNESC. The group meets every month to discuss community issues, contact with other Spanish-speaking organizations, and fund raising. The group functions only in an advisory capacity; the director does not share policy making. *Center director's comment:* "The members of our advisory committee are: Members of the state LULAC; members of other Hispanic Organizations; businessmen representative of the corporations that have donated monies for Discretionary Fund and Scholarship Fund; members of the community at large and representatives of our target population; students served by this center; and, parents. The group meets monthly to be informed about the progress of the center and its activities and also to provide input into it. It is actively involved in helping the center with functions such as the Scholarship Awards ceremony, annual sponsor's banquet, etc. All of its members serve as resource and contact persons to assist the center's director in her activities and projects. At times, it also assists in the recruitment and selection of personnel."

6.10.16 Feedback from community. Two community organizations provided information on the role of the Seattle LNESC. Both agencies have been provided valuable services by the center. Both felt that many people in the Spanish-speaking community knew about the services of the center and felt them very helpful and necessary. They shared a positive opinion of the center's services. One spokesman ventured the opinion that the center is largely a "one-man operation."

6.11 TOPEKA

6.11.1 Area. The Topeka LNESC serves counties in the central and eastern sections of the state as well as the Kansas City, Missouri metropolitan area. The total are covered is about 82,260 square miles. In the past it has covered the western part of the state as well.

6.11.2 Target population. In the area served, there are 5,990 low-income, Spanish-speaking persons over 18 years of age.

6.11.3 Location. 214 West 6th St., First Floor, Topeka, Kansas. The only comment we received concerning the location of the Topeka center was from one student who complained that parking is difficult there.

6.11.4 Staff. As of March 1977, the Topeka center included the director, a supervising counselor, 3 counselors, and a secretary, all full-time and all funded by CSA. Additional staff included: a full-time CETA MIS clerk typist/receptionist; a Mayor's Employment Program office clerk (10 hours/week), a Job Opportunity for Youth clerk typist (10 hours/week); a CETA secretary-counselor trainee (full-time); and a CETA office clerk (20 hours a week).

6.11.5 Caseload. In the 36 months the Topeka center has been in operation 2,613 contacts have been made. This average 73 contacts per month for the center, 18 per counselor. The average annual caseload for each counselor, therefore is 218 persons.

6.11.6 Number of low-income enrollees as percent of target population.

PY I	123	low-income enrollees
PY II	86	low-income enrollees (estimated)[36]
PY III	129	low-income enrollees
Total	338	low-income enrollees (estimated)[36]

338 ÷ 5,990 = 5.64% of target population enrolled.

---

[36] *Based on percent low-income enrolled by center in PY III (55%). Topeka LNESC did not identify the income level of 17% of PY III enrollees.*

6.11.7 Expenditures: Fixed/Variable/Total.

Program Year	Fixed Expenditures	Variable Expenditures	Total Expenditures
PY I	$122,861	$9,402	$132,263
PY II	65,527	1,782	67,309
PY III	91,437	3,518	94,955
All years		Subtotal--CSA	$294,527
City	23,974	Subtotal--City of Topeka	23,974*
		TOTAL	$318,501

**Center director's comment:* "It is important to note that....the purpose of the program funded with [the $23,974 revenue-sharing grant from the City of Topeka] was high school drop-out prevention. Because the clientele of that program were not potential post-secondary enrollments (at least for that fiscal year), they were not counted in our MIS in any category--not as contacts, not as enrollments, not as low-income clients."

6.11.8 Expenditure per target population.

$294,527 ÷ 5,990 = $49 per person of the target population.

6.11.9 Expenditure per enrollee (total).

$294,527 ÷ 1,113 = $265 per enrollee.

6.11.10 Expenditure per low-income enrollee.

$294,527 ÷ 338 = $871 per low-income enrollee.

6.11.11 Expenditure per contact (total).

$294,527 ÷ 2,613 = $113 per contact.

6.11.12 Expenditure per low-income contact.

PY I	158	low-income contacts (estimated)[37]
PY II	106	low-income contacts (estimated)[37]
PY III	227	low-income contacts
Total	491	low-income contacts (estimated)[37]

---

[37] *Based on percent low-income contacted by center in PY III; (19%) 40% of the contacts in PY III were unidentified as to income level.*

$294,527 ÷ 491 = $600 per low-income contact.

6.11.13 Retention/Follow-up. Funds provided by the City of Topeka's general revenue sharing plan ($23,974) were to encourage high school drop-outs to finish school. The drop-out rate had been 13% according to the school district. The Topeka LNESC counselled high school students outside of school, and the program was quite successful, but the city was not able to refund it when the grant ran out. The center now uses a Mexican-American graduate student in social work to counsel high school students.

6.11.13.1 For their college enrollees, the Topeka center asks students, by mail, how they are doing and what they need. Most students do not respond so the center does not know how many are enrolled. Students who do answer usually say that they need more money; those students are answered by mail telling them "what they already know; that they can't get additional money from the center."[38] The center has tried to get enrollment information from the colleges,but the registrars do not want to disclose the information. In Topeka, enrollment/retention information can be tracked down but there is nothing they can do about places elsewhere in the state. They do not make phone calls for follow-up outside Topeka because of the expense. The director suggested it might be useful to have a "circuit rider" whose full-time job would be to visit all the colleges in the state, contact the enrollees and find out how they are doing and how the center can help. They have tried to procure CETA funds for a staff person to study retention and follow-up, but CETA money will not cover travel or expenses.

6.11.13.2 *Director's comment:* "At one point, we utilized a program for a local service volunteer (action funded) in the capacity of "follow-up specialist". This volunteer was a Hispanic college student at Washburn University in Topeka. As part of his job he contacted Washburn students to determine if they were having problems. If they were, their LNESC counselor was notified and an attempt to intervene was made. It was also his job to systematically send a follow-up letter requesting information on adjustment to school, etc, to all enrollments with the instructions of each counselor, to record responses and to notify the client's counselor if there were problems--academic, financial, housing, family or personal, etc. This system worked reasonably well but had to be discontinued when the program for local services was defunded and we lost the volunteer. It was also difficult for the counselors to respond quickly and adequately and still maintain the emphasis on recruitment and counselling of potential enrollees."

---

[38] *Paraphrase of response to center phone questionnaire.*

6.11.13.3 There is not much the center is able to provide in support services, therefore, they refer most students to other agencies. When students do not know about the people at the school where they are enrolled, who can help them, the center tells them what's available. In addition, the center keeps in touch with support personnel in the colleges. Finally, they tell students about campus organizations which provide support, advice and academic help.

6.11.13.4 Of 16 students who replied to the student questionnaire, 12 are still enrolled, 4 are not. Five students received no follow-up support services after enrollment, ten have had from 1-6 contacts with the center since enrollment. Students who received follow-up support services were provided academic or career counselling by the center, financial aid or employment, and personal or family counselling. Some were referred for tutoring, financial aid or employment, and other (unspecified) services. Five students felt that the follow-up services they had received were helpful to them in staying in school (three would not have stayed in school without this help); two felt that the services had helped them some, while 4 felt the services did not assist them in staying in school.

6.11.14 *Feedback from students*. Thirty-three questionnaires were mailed out to students (31 delivered) and 16 were returned. This represents one of the lowest rates of non-delivery of all the centers, which may indicate either superior records updating or an exceptionally stable student population. Topeka also has by far the highest rate of completed questionnaire return, even when only delivered questionnaires are considered. Six students had first heard about LNESC when someone from the center came to his college, another received a letter from the center as his first contact. One student had never heard of the center.

6.11.14.1 Ten students were in high school or just graduated when they first learned about the center, one had dropped out of high school, three were in college and one had graduated from college. Six students said that they had no contact with the center before they enrolled.

Eight students had up to five contacts with the center, and two students did not answer the question.

6.11.14.2 The most frequently provided initial service was information about financial aid, followed by information about admissions. Six students received counselling about career and educational goals, five received help from filling out financial application forms, one student was helped when the center paid his application fees to law school. Six of the students said the initial service had helped them a great deal, while another six felt the services had not been very helpful (if at all) as far as getting into school.

6.11.15 Role of Advisory Group. Unknown. However, the center has a very good relationship with the local LULAC council, characterized by mutual understanding. Some of the center staff are on the council.

6.11.16 Feedback from community. Feedback from a Topeka Spanish-speaking organization was quite positive toward the local LNESC. The agency felt the center was very cooperative in coordinating non-duplicative services. The agency feels that many people in the Spanish-speaking community know about the center services and feel very positively about the services they have received. Their only suggestion was that the center could improve the "very good job" they are doing by concentrating more on follow-up. No feedback was obtained from the Topeka CAA, which declined to answer questions over the telephone.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I QUESTIONNAIRES USED FOR GATHERING INFORMATION FOR THE EVALUATION.

- I.A Questions for Field Visit to LNESC Headquarters
- I.B Questionnaires Mailed to Centers
- I.C Phone Questionnaire (for Centers not Visited)
- I.D Design for Field Visits to Centers
- I.E Questionnaire Mailed to Students
- I.F Questionnaire for Telephone Survey of Community Agencies

APPENDIX II NUMBERS IN LNESC TARGET POPULATION

APPENDIX III STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

APPENDIX IV FOLLOW-UP/RETENTION PROCEDURES

- Exhibit A: Albuquerque's Mail-Out to Students
- Exhibit B: Corpus Christi's Duplicate Student File Sheet for Alphabetical File

APPENDIX V SURVEY of FISCAL OPERATIONS, LULAC NATIONAL EDUCATION SERVICE CENTERS, June 1977

NOTE: Appendices I.A and I.B have been deleted due to poor legibility.

Appendices I.A and I.B

~~PAGE(S) ______ WAS~~ (WERE) ~~MISSING~~ (REMOVED) FROM

THIS DOCUMENT PRIOR TO ITS BEING SUBMITTED TO

THE ERIC DOCUMENT REPRODUCTION SERVICE.

APPENDIX I.C

PHONE QUESTIONNAIRE

Center directors were interviewed by telephone in order to get specific information not given on their mail questionnaire (Appendix I.B), to pursue points raised by questionnaire responses, or resolve discrepancies with budget figures obtained from Headquarters.

In addition, a few general questions were asked all centers, such as:

> How do you determine who receives which support services? (on request? based on financial need?)
>
> What is the relationship of your center with the local LULAC organization? Do you or your staff participate in LULAC's other projects and activities?

Centers which were selected for a site visit did not receive a telephone interview. The information was obtained instead by the visiting team (Appendix I.D).

APPENDIX I.D
DESIGN FOR FIELD VISITS TO CENTERS

DESIGN FOR FIELD VISITS TO CENTERS

I. GENERAL QUESTIONS

A. Overall project management:

1. Maintenance of center (floor plan, location, upkeep)

2. Office hours

3. Travel

4. Records

5. Staff
    - a. selection
    - b. annual evaluation
    - c. staff interaction (meetings, communication)
    - d. turnover (vacant positions)
    - e. division & description of responsibilities
    - f. salaries

6. Project finances
    - a. monthly financial report (timely, accurate, documentation)
    - b. petty cash fund (records)
    - c. inventory (accurate & accountable)
    - d. time sheets (accurate, timely)
    - e. centralized reconciliation statement
    - f. extraordinary expenses (what, how much)

(continued)

A. 6. g. budget categories

	PYI	PYII	PYIII	Guidelines	Comments
Phone					
Space					
Supplies					
Equipment					
Printing					
In-town travel					
Out-of-town travel					
Licenses					
Secretarial services					
Employee development (What)					

h. Project self-evaluation

	PYI	PYII	PYIII	Objectives PYIV	Yr.-to-date
Contacts					
Poverty criteria					
Enrollments					
Fin.Aid $					
Cost/Enroll					
Cost/Contact					

Comments

I.D 1

(continued)

B. Advisory Group

1. Composition

2. Frequency of meetings

3. Function

4. Examples of actions:

5. Opinion of effectiveness, efficiency

C. Effectiveness

1. Communication with students

a. how many/week

b. how many/counselor*

c. modes of communication

d. problems

2. Communication with high schools

a. frequency/student

b. type of interactions, frequency

c. feedback on effectiveness

d. problems

3. Retention

a. follow-up after first contact (to aid, counsel, encourage, tutor)

b. referral follow-up

c. checks on progress, status

(continued)

C. 3. d. frequency of communication with college/student

e. content of interaction with college

f. feedback from colleges

g. problems

h. suggestions

4. Raising public awareness

a. means

b. measures

c. problems

D. Reaction to evaluation

1. Center questionnaires

2. Phone calls

3. Student lists

4. Student questionnaires

5. Site visits

II. SPECIFIC QUESTIONS

Questions for each center visited, in lieu of phone questionnaire (See Appendix I.C).

III. REVIEW OF STUDENT FILES

Student File Review Form
L/NESC Site Visit________________________

_____contact
_____enrollee
_____other (what:____________________)

Reviewer:______

Present	Absent	
___	___	1) Student's name
___	___	2) Student's address
___	___	3) Student's age
___	___	4) Student's educ. status
___	___	5) Name of school
___	___	6) Parent's name(s)
___	___	7) Parent's address(es)
___	___	8) Ethnicity (student)
___	___	9) Marital status
___	___	10) # of dependents
___	___	11) Student's(+spouse) income
___	___	12) Parents' income(s)
___	___	13) Financial aid forms

*Other contacts (specify):

**Other types of content (specify):

14) date of first contact__________
15) date of last contact __________
16) # of contacts: TOTAL __________
17) # contacts: in person__________
18) # of contacts: phone __________
19) # of contacts: mail __________
20) # of contacts: other*__________
21) circle: COMPLETE INCOMPLETE

22) Type of content	# of type
academic/career couns.	_____
personal/family couns.	_____
tutoring	_____
legal assistance	_____
child care	_____
housing	_____
financial aid	_____
employment	_____
social activities	_____
referral to other agency	_____
other**	_____

APPENDIX I.E
QUESTIONNAIRE MAILED TO STUDENTS

STATE OF WASHINGTON
STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION
RESEARCH & PLANNING OFFICE

115 N. 85th St., Suite 200
Seattle, Washington 98103
Telephone (206) 464-7031
SCAN 576-7031

May 6, 1977

Dear Student:

We want to know what you think. Since 1973, LULAC National Educational Service Centers have been providing services under a federal grant from the Community Services Administration (formerly the Office of Economic Opportunity). We have been asked by Community Services Administration to assess the effectiveness of the services which LULAC Educational Centers provide. Since the aim of LULAC Educational Center services has been to help students enroll and remain in school, we need to know from students whether L/NESC helped them. Since we cannot interview each student personally, we have selected a small group of students to whom we have sent the enclosed questionnaire.

As you will notice, there is no space for your name on the questionnaire. Therefore, when we receive your questionnaire we will not know whose comments we are reading. We hope this reassures you that you can respond to the questionnaire freely. Please answer all the questions. If you feel that you do not understand a question, or that the responses listed below a question do not allow you to answer what you feel, please write your answer briefly next to the question.

Enclosed is a stamped envelope addressed to our office. Please return the completed questionnaire in that envelope on or before May 20, 1977. The time you take to provide this information will help Community Services Administration and the LULAC National Educational Services Centers to provide the best assistance to you and your fellow students in the future.

Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

Catherine E. McIntyre

Catherine E. McIntyre
Project Analyst
Research & Planning Office
WASHINGTON STATE BOARD FOR
COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION

CEM:eas
Enc.

I.E 2

LNESC Student Questionnaire

1. Where did you attend high school? ______________________
city state

2. Did you graduate from high school? ☐ Yes When? ____________
☐ No month year

3. When did you first enroll in college or vocational/technical school? ______________ Name of school: ______________
month year

4. Type of school:
☐ Vocational/technical training
☐ Jr. or community college
☐ 4-year college or university
☐ Other (What? ______________________)

5. Have you graduated or finished the program? ☐ Yes
☐ No

6. Have you been a regularly enrolled student since you first entered (except for summer vacations)? ☐ Yes
☐ No

7. If you have dropped out, please give the month and year of each time you dropped out and each time you reentered (except for summers):

Dropped Out (month, year)	Went Back (month, year)

8. Are you enrolled in school now? ☐ Yes
☐ No

9. What kind of program are you now enrolled in, if different from #4 above?

☐ Vocational/technical training
☐ Jr. or community college
☐ Undergraduate in 4-year college or university
☐ Graduate or professional
☐ Other (What? ______________________)

10. Do you plan to graduate? ☐ Yes
☐ No

11. What are your plans after graduation? ______________________

____

12. How did you first hear about the LULAC National Education Service Centers?

☐ From your high school counselor
☐ Someone from the Center came to your high school
☐ Friends told you about it
☐ Saw a poster or other publicity (such as radio or newspaper)
☐ Other (How?____________________________________)

13. When was your first contact with your LULAC Education Center?

____
month year

14. What was your status at that time? (Example: high school senior, graduated from high school, dropped out of high school, graduated from community college, dropped out of college, etc.)_______________

____

15. What kinds of services did you receive from your Center?

☐ Counseling about career and educational goals

☐ Information about admissions

☐ Help filling out admissions applications forms

☐ Active help with the admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)

☐ Information about financial aid

☐ Help filling out financial aid application forms

☐ Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)

☐ Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you

☐ Other (What?____________________________________)

16. How much would you say these services actually helped you in getting into school?

☐ Would not have got into school without this help
☐ Helped a great deal
☐ Helped some
☐ Not really very much help
☐ Did not help

17. How many times did you have contact with your Center before you got into school?______________________________

How many times have you had contact with the Center since you have been in school?____

Have you had contact with Centers in other cities also? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Where?________________________
city state

18. What kinds of services have you received from the Center since you've been in school?

Center provided the service	Center helped you obtain the service	Service
☐	☐	Academic or career counseling
☐	☐	Personal or family counseling
☐	☐	Tutoring
☐	☐	Legal assistance
☐	☐	Childcare
☐	☐	Housing
☐	☐	Financial aid or employment
☐	☐	Social activities
☐	☐	Other (What?________________________)

19. How much would you say these services actually helped you with staying in school?

☐ Would not have stayed in school without this help
☐ Helped a great deal
☐ Helped some
☐ Not really very much help
☐ Did not help

20. How often does the Center contact you to see how you're doing?____
When was the last time you had contact with your Center?_________
month/year

21. Are you: female? ☐
male? ☐ What is your age? ________________

Would you say your background is:
☐ Mexican-American
☐ Black
☐ Anglo
☐ Native-American
☐ Cuban
☐ Puerto Rican
☐ Filipino
☐ Oriental-American
☐ Other (What?____________________________________)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problems students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC Education Center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

24. What do you think the Center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

You have now completed the questionnaire. Please place it in the stamped envelope addressed to WASHINGTON STATE BOARD FOR COMMUNITY COLLEGE EDUCATION, Research & Planning Office, 115 N. 85th St., #200, Seattle, Washington 98103, and mail it by May 20, 1977.

Muchas gracias

APPENDIX I.F.
QUESTIONNAIRE FOR TELEPHONE SURVEY OF COMMUNITY AGENCIES

Name of organization ______________________ phone no. ________

Nature of organization ______________________________________

Person providing information ________________________________

Date completed ____

1. Has your agency had contact with the LULAC National Educational Service Center in your city?
What is the name of the person from LNESC with whom you talked/met?

2. What was the purpose of these contacts/meetings?

What was the outcome of them?

3. In your opinion, do many people in the Spanish-speaking community know about LNESC's services?

What are their feelings about these services?
(i.e. helpful, no help)

4. What is your opinion of LNESC's services?

APPENDIX II
NUMBERS IN LNESC TARGET POPULATION

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Albuquerque	TOTAL	289,490	102,042	54.0	55,094
	Bernalillo	123,814	44,692	54.5	24,358
	Colfax	6,464	2,913	54.7	1,593
	Dona Ana	35,439	757	51:5	390
	Grant	12,354	3,165	55.0	1,741
	Mora	4,419	3,318	55.4	1,837
	Rio Arriba	20,691	9,885	53.6	5,300
	Roosevelt	2,524	1,510	57.3	864
	Sandoval	11,159	6,733	51.9	3,492
	Santa Fe	34,883	12,967	55.4	7,177
	Taos	15,109	7,796	55.0	4,286
	Valencia	22,634	8,306	52.4	4,350

1/ Provided by LNESC research staff. Counties in the metropolitan area of Kansas City, MO were added to those in eastern and central Kansas, served by Topeka.

2/ Source: U.S. Dept. of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, Characteristics of the Population, 1970. Volume I, Table 129 for each state, by county.

3/ Source: Ibid, Table 133 for each state, by county.

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Boston	TOTAL	47,167	13,242	56.7	7,466
	Bristol	2,897	1,170	49.4	578
	Essex	5,993	1,349	54.8	739
	Middlesex	12,993	2,082	57.7	1,202
	Norfolk	3,627	323	60.6	196
	Plymouth	2,195	320	52.6	168
	Suffolk	19,462	7,998	57.3	4,583
Chicago	Cook	286,882	66,900	54.3	36,344
Colorado Springs	TOTAL	73,038	24,491	52.7	12,794
	Crowley	529	297	51.6	153
	Eagle	1,929	277	50.5	140
	El Paso	20,115	5,834	54.7	3,194

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Colorado Springs (cont'd)	Fremont	1,870	509	53.6	273
	Lake	2,082	460	52.4	241
	Otero	7,126	4,146	48.8	2,025
	Prowers	2,299	1,221	46.8	571
	Pueblo	37,088	11,747	52.8	6,197
	TOTAL	197,605	106,453	53.[illegible]	56,510
Corpus Christi	Aransas	2,372	1,491	47.1	702
	Bee	8,892	6,212	52.3	3,251
	Brooks	6,399	4,090	56.1	2,296
	Duval	9,905	6,566	58.4	3,832
	Jim Wells	21,125	11,381	54.4	6,188
	Kenedy	522	335	63.8	214
	Kleberg	14,560	8,457	58.6	4,952
	Live Oak	2,703	1,873	49.8	932

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Corpus Christi (cont'd)	McMullen	743	279	53.2	148
	Nueces	103,543	48,542	52.5	25,467
	Refugio	3,610	2,093	54.7	1,144
	San Patricio	23,231	15,134	48.8	7,384
	TOTAL	254,277	70,529	53.0	37,149
Houston	Brazoria	10,769	3,211	53.2	1,707
	Chambers	467	204	48.6	99
	Fort Bend	13,890	6,208	47.7	2,962
	Galveston	20,372	5,352	53.6	2,867
	Harris	185,715	47,155	53.1	25,033
	Jefferson	10,982	2,132	58.8	1,254
	Matagorda	5,162	2,804	50.1	1,404
	Wharton	6,920	3,463	52.6	1,823

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Phoenix	TOTAL	229,944	75,690	52.9	39,923
	Coconino	6,421	1,133	56.9	645
	Maricopa	140,607	48,696	51.6	25,143
	Pima	82,916	25,861	54.7	14,135
Pomona	TOTAL	1,635,362	348,016	56.2	195,252
	Los Angeles	1,289,311	271,448	57.2	155,154
	Orange	160,168	24,259	53.2	12,915
	Riverside	76,621	24,700	50.7	12,514
	San Bernardino	109,262	27,609	53.1	14,669
San Francisco	TOTAL	164,940	24,124	63.6	15,605
	San Francisco	101,901	19,097	66.0	12,608
	San Mateo	63,039	5,027	59.6	2,997

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Seattle	TOTAL	52,275	13,968	54.9	6,860
	King	20,952	2,509	59.1	1,484
	Kitsap	1,369	133	63.0	84
	Pierce	9,234	1,285	64.5	829
	Skagit	1,295	466	46.2	215
	Snohomish	3,226	379	50.0	189
	Thurston	687	59	55.6	33
	Whatcom	956	88	50.2	44
	Yakima	14,556	9,049	44.0	3,982
Topeka	TOTAL	53,184	11,040	54.5	5,990
	Buchanan (MO)	1,065	193	53.9	104
	Clay (MO)	1,466	130	49.0	64
	Cowley	920	271	52.5	142
	Douglas	686	183	69.8	128

APPENDIX II (continued)

Center	Counties Served 1/	Number of Hispanics 2/	Number of Low income Hispanics 3/	Percent over 18 years 2/	Low income Hispanics over 18
Topeka (cont'd)	Geary	818	188	73.8	139
	Grant	563	236	46.4	109
	Harvey	767	167	60.9	102
	Jackson (MO)	14,321	2,906	53.7	1,561
	Johnson	3,098	242	49.4	120
	Johnson (MO)	675	74	67.0	50
	Leavenworth	1,618	290	56.9	165
	Lyon	1,313	370	56.4	209
	Montgomery	505	97	55.0	53
	Reno	1,475	419	53.2	223
	Rice	410	34	52.7	18
	Riley	1,619	243	70.0	170
	Saline	924	425	43.9	187
	Sedgwick	8,141	1,891	52.6	994
	Shawnee	6,483	1,305	53.4	697
	Sumner	645	209	44.3	93
	Wyandotte	5,672	1,167	56.7	662

APPENDIX III
STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

A. Albuquerque

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled Dec. 1974 through Mar. 1977; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out	63
Number not returned by post office*	52
Number returned completed	8

Ethnicity of Respondents

6	Mexican American
1	Anglo
1	Native American

Enrolled now?

5	Yes
1	No
2	Graduated

Age of Respondents

3	18-20 years old
3	21-25 years old
1	26-30 years old
1	No answer

How did student first hear about LNESC?

1	High School Counselor
1	Someone from center came to school
6	Friends referred
0	Poster or other publicity
0	Other

Status at time of first contact

4	In high school
1	Graduated from high school, not in college
2	Graduated from high school, in college
1	Dropped out of high school

Number of contacts before student got into school

1	None
2	1-2 times
3	3-4 times
1	> 4 times
1	Other ("off and on")

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

A. Albuquerque (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service) 1/

1 Counselling about career and education goals
2 Information about admissions
2 Help filling out admissions forms
0 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
4 Information about financial aid
1 Help filling out financial aid application forms
2 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
1 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

1 Would not have got into school without this help
1 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
1 Not really very much help
4 Did not help (includes 2 already in college)

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

3 None
5 1-2 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 2/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
0	2	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
0	0	Tutoring
0	1	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	1	Housing
1	3	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
1 3/	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

0 Would not have stayed in school without this help
2 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
1 Not really much help
4 Did not help

1/ One student received no initial service.
2/ Two students received no follow-up support service.
3/ Newsletter

A. Albuquerque (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"The main problem, as I perceive it, is the lack of coordinated information on financial aid. The students who are forced to learn about aid on a trial-and-error bases."

"One: deciding on a major, two: worrying about financial needs--, three: deciding what college to attend, four: getting poor grades for first semester and wanting to dropout, and five: trying to keep a good GPA keep a scholarship."

"Financial aid available is not publicized enough. Many Chicano students do not attend school because they do not know that aid is available. I found that my high school counselor did not tell me about all the aid I was eligible for."

"Financial difficulties."

"Lack of money and lack of transportation."

"Financial aid."

"LULAC in Albuquerque provided services for only families of LULAC members. If a person was a non-member he would get little or no services. The biggest problem students face are financial, by giving financial aid only to LULAC members does not help students who really need the help."

23. What do you think are some of the best things that LULAC the education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"Discrimination against Chicanos by Chicanos (LULAC) will never help students (especially financially) overcome discrimination against Chicanos by Anglos."

"Provide students with working scholarships."

"The only thing that LULAC helped me with was to get into school and some applications and nothing else. I needed some help in transportation but they couldn't when they said they could."

"Helps with financial aid program."

"LULAC helps one with the scholarships offered. This is the only benefit I got from LULAC. I was completely turned off by the program simply because the people seemed there didn't want to help me." (Student is Anglo)

A. Albuquerque (cont'd)

"The only contacts that I have had with the center has entailed my filling out forms for their records. I think the center could be of substantial help to the students but for me it has not been."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"I think more information about the activities and services of the center should be made available to a larger group of people."

"It would be helpful if LULAC made it clear to students that the services are not only for minorities but also for majorities."

"Make it clear to students about financial aid available to them. Send out news letters about new developments and financial aid to current college students. 'Get the lead out' Go out and tell students about your program instead of having students come to your office."

"Contact you more often while in school."

"Yes before LULAC sends people to school, they should give them transportation of some sort. Either bus tokens or yearly bus pass or cardfor every year a person is in school, and if that person quits, his card would be terminated. I think LULAC should make periodic checks on their students just to see if they are going to school or not."

"Look into the records of graduating high school students that would like to go to school and have a good GPA and can't because of the financial status. Maybe give them a working scholarship if possible!!"

"End the(written or unwritten) policy of LULAC (Albuquerque, New Mexico) of providing services only to LULAC members. Must provide services to all Chicano students that need help not just for LULAC students."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

B. Boston

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled Dec. 1974 through Mar. 1977; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment, plus 2.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 8
Number not returned by post office* 8
Number returned completed 3

Ethnicity of Respondents

3 Mexican Americans

Enrolled now?

3 Yes
0 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

2 18-20 years old
1 21-25 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

0 High School Counselor
0 Someone from center came to school
0 Friends referred
1 Poster or other publicity
2 Other (contacted by center via mail)

Status at time of first contact

2 In high school
1 Graduated from high school, not in college
0 Graduated from high school, in college

Number of contacts before student got into school

1 None
1 1-2 times
1 3-4 times

* Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

B. Boston (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

0 Counselling about career and education goals
1 Information about admissions
0 Help filling out admissions forms
0 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
3 Information about financial aid
2 Help filling out financial aid application forms
1 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
1 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

0 Would not have got into school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
2 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

1 None
1 1-2 times
1 More than 4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment [1]

Provided by	Referred by	Service
1	0	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
0	0	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
0	1	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

1 Would not have stayed in school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
0 Not really much help
2 Did not help

---

[1] Two students received no follow-up support services.

B. Boston (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"The greatest problem I have faced is the transition from San Francisco to Harvard. I work this problem out successfully by the end of my first semester. Most of my Chicano colleagues at Harvard faced similar situations."

"I think that the student has to face responsibility both for getting or attempting to get into school, and the ability to stay in school. If he does not feel responsible and assure of himself, he will not be able to get anywhere. Also, the problem of financial aid is big."

"The major problem I had was re-entering school once I had dropped out. One of the counselors went directly to the institution I had applied to and represented me. He helped me get into the institution I am presently attending. The next most significant problem was getting financial aid." (this student was also assisted by the Corpus Christi Center)

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"They take pride in helping students. They found a counselor that works with you on a one-to-one basis. They also provide you with application for admission and financial aid to most any college or university in the country."

"LULAC has not really contacted me or helped me so I cannot answer this question do to lack of knowledge."

"I don't know. Counselling?"

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"Follow-up more on your cases. Also, provide each LULAC (regional) office with adequate fundings for scholarships and publicized!"

"I think if it would remain in touch with the students it would help."

"I think they should make themselves more well known. Not many students know about LULAC. I also think that they should employ only people that know Spanish and that know what it is like to be a Chicana, Puerto Rican, Cuban, etc."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

C. Chicago

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1974 through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 20
Number not returned by post office* 17
Number returned completed 2

Ethnicity of Respondents

2 Mexican Americans

Enrolled now?

2 Yes
0 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

2 21-25 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

0 High School Counselor
1 Someone from center came to school
1 Friends referred
0 Poster or other publicity
0 Other

Status at time of first contact

0 In high school
1 Graduated from high school, not in college
1 Graduated from high school, in college

Number of contacts before student got into school

1 None
1 (More than four times)

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

C. Chicago (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

1 Counselling about career and education goals
1 Information about admissions
1 Help filling out admissions forms
1 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
2 Information about financial aid
1 Help filling out financial aid application forms
1 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
1 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

1 Would not have got into school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
0 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

1 Once
1 More than 4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment

Provided by	Referred by	Service
0	1	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
0	1	Tutoring
0	1	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
1	1	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

1 Would not have stayed in school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really much help
0 Did not help

C. Chicago (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"One: Financial assistance, two: Curricular counselling; and three: Scholastic goal and career goal guidance."

"Language communication."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"Can provide financial aid."

"Knowledge of extended routes is essentially passive."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"Not be so formal in presentation of financial aid."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

D. Colorado Springs

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1973, through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 48
Number not returned by post office* 36
Number returned completed 8

Ethnicity of Respondents

6 Mexican Americans
1 Filipino
1 Asian American

Enrolled now?

5 Yes
2 No
1 Graduated

Age of Respondents

5 18-20 years old
3 21-25 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

2 High School Counselor
2 Someone from center came to school
3 Friends referred
0 Poster or other publicity
1 Other (did not hear of the center)

Status at time of first contact

4 In high school
2 Graduated from high school, not in college
1 Graduated from high school, in college
1 Not applicable (no contacts)

Number of contacts before student got into school

2 None
2 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
3 More than 4 times

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

D. Colorado Springs (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

3 Counselling about career and education goals
6 Information about admissions
6 Help filling out admissions forms
1 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
7 Information about financial aid
7 Help filling out financial aid application forms
2 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
2 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

2 Would not have got into school without this help
3 Helped a great deal
2 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
0 Did not help
1 No answer

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

3 None
3 1-2 times
2 3-4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment [1/]

Provided by	Referred by	Service
1	0	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
0	0	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
2	4	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
1	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

1 Would not have stayed in school without this help
2 Helped a great deal
2 Helped some
0 Not really much help
2 Did not help
1 No answer

[1/] Two students received no follow-up support services.

D. Colorado Springs (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"I just came to the USA nearly two years. So the problem I have at school are languages. English is the most difficult problem for me at school."

"The biggest problem is money for tuition, books, and so on."

"When first going into college or post high school education I had noticed that many of the students did not have a goal. Either on the type of degree they are going to graduate with or what to do with their future. By the time they realize one or two years have been wasted. Lack of motivation toward school studies is what a lot of people have."

"I never really faced any problems. LULAC really helped me get a good grant and this money paid for my tuition and fees. The only thing was that I was so busy doing school work I never had time for anything else. But it paid at the end." (Student completed four year degree in two and a half years)

"Money, adjustments, and studies."

"Just keeping good grades and getting help with homework."

"None."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"Help them with their problems."

"I don't know, I did not know they did give this kind of help."

"Financial aid and summer orientation."

"LULAC sure helps the money problem. They try their best to help you in every way possible. They are really are concerned with your needs of a student."

"I could not say, I never received much help."

"LULAC helps students get financial aid."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

D. Colorado Springs (cont'd)

"We need special English classes for Oriental students."

"To really, really become involved with them. Not just filling out papers but to actually show them procedures. To help them find a goal they want. The center should be a counselor type thing."

"They do everything pretty well now. But what really helps is they do most of the paper work which most students hate to do which takes the load off the mind of a busy student."

"Follow through on their facilities while the student is in the university."

"Let the student know through advertisements what they offer."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

E. Corpus Christi

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled April 1973 through Mar. '77: number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out	88
Number not returned by post office *	79
Number returned completed	19

Ethnicity of Respondents

15	Mexican Americans
1	Black
2	Anglos
1	No answer

Enrolled now?

12	Yes
3	No
2	Graduated
2	No answer

Age of Respondents

13	18-20 years old
4	21-25 years old
1	31-45 years old
1	No answer

How did student first hear about LNESC?

9	High School Counselor
2	Someone from center came to school
8	Friends referred
0	Poster or other publicity
0	Other

Status at time of first contact

9	In high school
6	Graduated from high school, not in college
3	Graduated from high school, in college
1	High school dropout

Number of contacts before student got into school

2	None
6	1-2 times
7	3-4 times
3	More than four times
1	No answer

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

E. Corpus Christi (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

6 Counselling about career and education goals
10 Information about admissions
12 Help filling out admissions forms
2 1/ Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
15 Information about financial aid
18 Help filling out financial aid application forms
3 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
3 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

7 Would not have got into school without this help
9 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
3 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

10 None
8 1-2 times
1 3-4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 2/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
3	0	Academic or career counselling
1	0	Personal or family counselling
0	2	Tutoring
1	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
3	7	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school 3/

4 Would not have stayed in school without this help
4 Helped a great deal
2 Helped some
0 Not really much help
4 Did not help

1/ Waiver on registration deadline for one student, special application to military academy for another student.
2/ Eight students received no follow-up support services.
3/ Five students did not answer this question.

E. Corpus Christi (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"The problem students face getting into school is that the student does not know where to go to get enrolled. High school counselors do not take interest in the average student, consequently the student knows nothing about getting into college. The problem is the lack of communication between schools and students."

"Financially it was very rough. One year it was one figure for tuition and etc. So based on what was given that year, you were given the same the following year. When everything was raised leaving a large balance. Parents couldn't afford to assist me at times."

"Some of the problems I faced were getting professional information and comments from certain schools. LULAC suggested some of the best colleges for my major. They provided me with a great deal of helpful information. They even made a personal contact with the people of the college of my choice."

"Transportation to and from school, sufficient funds, proper housing, especially location, eating properly, racial hatred, fear, and ignorance."

"I think high school counselors should better prepare students in the area of financial aid, career placement, and requirements of major universities when transfering from a junior college. I lost several hours which UT did not except."

"Getting into school is usually induced by parents. Staying in school is usually a question of economics. But with a sincere direction, of personal importance of the student, economics and funds fall into place. Without this one must dropout' until this direction is solved."

"My profession is Occupational Therapy. During our academic years we are trained for nine months in different hospitals. I needed financial assistance because I had to be trained out of state for four months. This required financial assistance and my application was denied."

"I had to drive about 30 miles everyday to get to the university. After I get home, I drive 20 miles to work; I work 30-36 hours a week to meet my expenses and needs. I got home very sleepy and found no time to study. I felt lost in the university, took sixteen hours, passed 10, failed 6. I felt I couldn't go on any more." (The student said he didn't expect to graduate)

E. Corpus Christi (cont'd)

"There aren't really those many problems getting into college. The problem's whether the student is really interested in college itself. After one is a student staying with it is another thing a student has to realize, even though it gets hard."

"No money and no transportation."

"The finances are limited and it's hard to make ends meet."

"Some of the difficulties I have come across are that I don't have a car and it is a lot of trouble to get rides. I have been thinking of getting out of school for a while and trying to get a job so that I can get myself a car and go back to school. I hope my plans work out. Another problem is that of money for rent, food, and clothing. I don't know what I would do if I didn't have the work study."

"Don't really know if I would be allowed a better job, due to lack of job opportunities, and actually this has made me wonder whether or not to stay in school."

"My only problems are that I am studying in Mexico (Monterrey) and they are over-crowded which doesn't let me or give me the opportunity for some classes I want to enroll in."

"The problem is not getting into school, it is staying in school which many students have difficulty dealing with. The reasons for this is from poor learning habits and the lack of good high school educational systems, which cause many students to drop from school with poor grades. I have not encountered any difficulties so far yet."

"Besides the fact that tuition fees are very high, books and supplies take up too much money. That is one of the major problems because if the student enrolls in college and then has no way of buying books, he is not going to pass his courses."

"Since school regulations have been stricter about being on scholastic probation, it has been difficult for students to remain in school. My difficulties have been, when it is time for registration the BEOG grants are not in and I have a hard time buying my books because of this problem. As for the other students, they can't receive any help because of their grades."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"From my experience, the LULAC does not help at all. I received more help from my special counselor. I feel LULAC discriminates against the average student. LULAC also rates a big zero when it comes to encouragement."

"They have assisted me in seeking different types of scholarships and financial assistance. They also gave me counselling and aid in my career."

"Same as 22; LULAC has been very helpful and has gotten me started with my education. They made personal contact with me and made sure I had everything correct and done. They are very concerned people."

"Counselling or advice, pertaining to financial aid, and general procedures."

"It does help in financial aid info. and giving more detail about college requirements."

"LULAC helps the funding fall into place."

"It helps many students to stay in school but many applications are denied due to the LULAC center feeling they need to help starting freshmen rather than those students needing only two years of schooling le[illegible]"

"I had no time to meet these people regularly, but I feel they were great people, and were willing to help anyone in need of their help."

"Helping filling the forms, and the grant."

"One thing is that they really help a person get into college and that is one of the main things. As for other things, I am not that involved with them to tell you."

"Helping to get financial aids that are available."

"They help fill out applications for financial aid and give information about financial aid."

"They do help a lot of students do very well. I am well informed that they are there to help if I need them."

"Mostly I think their financial and legal and paper work help, really help."

"I would not know how the LULAC education center could help these students overcome these difficulties. Since I am not familiar with the center helping students this way, only financially."

"I really do not know much about LULAC but I have received offers forloans. That is one good hope for students knowing that if he or she really needs money, may be LULAC will be able to help him or her out."

"I had no idea what LULAC does to help students overcome these difficulties."

E. Corpus Christi (cont'd)

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"I feel LULAC should become more interested in the students and stop interfering with our local affairs. The center should hire people who will help students and give the encouragement needed to help the student get a good start in their career. The student wants help but what good is it when they look for help and just gets pushed aside by the people who give help."

"I think it is all right the way it is."

"I like the center the way it is, however I do feel they need more publicity around my city to get students interested in education. I feel students need to know about these wonderful free services which have helped me go to college."

"According to advise or assistance offered it was somewhat encouraging to my personal needs and circumstances."

"I really can't comment here because I was not that much in contact with the center because my financial need was not that great. However, a friend from whom I heard about the center would never have gotten as far as she did without them and neither would her sister, a college grad."

"If the center were to do only what it did for me, it would be worth many times over the appropriation that it now receives."

"Divide their services so that entering freshmen and upper class get the same benefits."

"I am sure they are doing their best, the rest is up to the students to seek their help."

"Help any student with any problem they might have."

"Nothing, I think they do a pretty good job."

"I don't have any idea."

"Contact and discuss school attendance, grades, etc. during the student's attendance at school."

[illegible]rtise more so more people could use LULAC's help."

Encourage the student!"

"I am not familiar with the center or how it operates so I can't truly answer this question."

"Not too many students at college heard about the financial aid available. If advertising the aid you give, students could look for your aid."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

F. Houston

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled Dec. 1974 through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 65
Number not returned by post office* 52
Number returned completed 6

Ethnicity of Respondents

3 Mexican Americans
2 Anglos
1 "Latin"

Enrolled now?

6 Yes
0 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

2 18-20 years old
3 21-25 years old
1 26-30 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

2 High School Counselor
2 Someone from center came to school
0 Friends referred
1 Poster or other publicity
1 Other (speaker sponsored by Center at college)

Status at time of first contact

3 In high school
1 Graduated from high school, not in college
1 Graduated from high school, in college
1 College dropout

Number of contacts before student got into school

4 None
1 Four times
1 More than four times

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

F. Houston (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service) 1/

1 Counselling about career and education goals
2 Information about admissions
1 Help filling out admissions forms
1 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
3 Information about financial aid
3 Help filling out financial aid application forms
2 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
1 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

2 Would not have got into school without this help
1 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
1 Not really very much help
2 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

3 None
2 1-2 times
1 Other ("frequently")

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 2/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
0	0	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
0	0	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
1	2	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

1 Would not have stayed in school without this help
1 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
0 Not really much help
4 Did not help

1/ Two students received no initial services.
2/ Three students received no follow-up support services

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"The lack of Chicanos in the medicine field needs to be attended to and I have found that the LULAC center is lacking in its counselling ability. I know this is the answer to number 24."

"Getting into school is not very difficult if the problem of financing and education is taken care of. However, being in school requires much discipline, ie. making the grades. Also students fail to seek academic counselling which leads to disillusionment and dropping out."

"A big difficulty is finding a job. Most of the time a scholarship is not enough. I need a job just in the afternoons and preferably in an office and most of the time employers hire relatives of their employees."

"None. Some of the courses are not available at ______ college."

"Lack of organization and registration process."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"I believe that one of the first things that LULAC helps the students just giving them monitary help and then helping students to decide on a career and talking and caring about students."

"I would suppose that the information regarding financial aid would be the most beneficial for students. I cannot infer from my own experience however, I never took the advantage of the services although I was somewhat aware of what it offered."

"I don't know."

"I wouldn't know!"

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"The representative visited our class, but no one I knew of needed or used the center services. They stayed a whole period--a total waste! Could have been available at the main office for people who really did need the services available. I believe I did receive a package of some sort which had more information in it about grants and some other things, which might have been helpful if I had been eligible."

"I have only spoken to a lady from that place and she was a great help."

"It does need to help other races a little more. There are agencies to help black Americans, but what about the whites? There are poor and middle class whites that need help just as well as other races. I'veseen well-off Mexicans who don't need aid get it. It's not fair."

"I cannot say what this center could do differently since I am not aware of its service explicitly."

"Just now I am realizing how much LULAC can help people, because I didn't know about it before you sent me this paper. I think LULAC can help a lot, and I thank you forever." (This student also requested that we send more information about the LULAC center).

"I would like to say that the LULAC education center needed exposure when I was going to school, and although I really don't need their services anymore, I recommend then at every opportunity."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

G. Phoenix

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1973 through Mar. 1977; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 75
Number not returned by post office* 61
Number returned completed 5

Ethnicity of Respondents

4 Mexican Americans
1 Native American

Enrolled now?

3 Yes
1 No
1 Graduated

Age of Respondents

3 18-20 years old
1 21-25 years old
1 26-30 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

1 High School Counselor
2 Someone from center came to school
1 Friends referred
0 Poster or other publicity
1 Other (never heard of LULAC Education Service Centers)

Status at time of first contact

2 In high school
1 Graduated from high school, not in college
1 Not applicable
1 College dropout

Number of contacts before student got into school

2 None
1 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
1 More than 4 times

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

G. Phoenix (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service) 1/

1 Counselling about career and education goals
1 Information about admissions
2 Help filling out admissions forms
0 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
4 Information about financial aid
3 Help filling out financial aid application forms
0 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
2 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
1 Other ("a great deal of encouragement")

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into schoo

1 Would not have got into school without this help
1 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
1 Not really very much help
2 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

2 None
1 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
1 More than 4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 2/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
0	2	Academic or career counselling
0	1	Personal or family counselling
0	0	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
0	2	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

0 Would not have stayed in school without this help
1 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really much help
3 Did not help

1/One student received no initial services
2/Two students received no follow-up support services.

G. Phoenix (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"As for myself, I did not run into any problems that caused me to discontinue my education. As for others that I know of, have problems with classes whether it be the instructor or the subject. Most students drop in a week or two. It is a new environment."

"Finding the right major and being sure of what you are getting into."

"Financial--need a full time job, child care, only able to attend evening classes because of financial and full-time child care, and not all classes are offered in the evening."

"Poor counselling about opportunities at four year institutions; also scholarship information has been extremely poor."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"Really don't know."

"They help you realize that there are financial aid programs you are eligible for. They help you with scheduling. They also encourage you to continue at your education and a need for a college education."

"That you know more about this organization. I never really heard about it."

"Prepare them by offering orientations on what to expect in a college or university. Advise them to seek help if they come across any difficulties at first or whenever. Most counselors are busy at this time. An alternative could be for LULAC to set up a table for a couple of weeks offering assistance."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"Don't have any ideas at this time."

"This center doesn't help with employment. I am sure if they were able to help with references to employment that would also help a great deal. Overall these centers are very helpful to people with these needs."

"Give more information on financial aid opportunities and scholarships."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

H. Pomona

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1973 through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 27
Number not returned by post office* 24
Number returned completed 9

Ethnicity of Respondents

6 Mexican Americans
1 Black
1 Anglo
1 Asia American

Enrolled now?

6 Yes
3 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

5 18-20 years old
2 21-25 years old
1 26-30 years old
1 31-45 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

2 High School Counselor
3 Someone from center came to school
3 Friends referred
1 Poster or other publicity
0 Other

Status at time of first contact

5 In high school
1 Graduated from high school, not in college
2 Graduated from high school, in college
1 High school dropout

Number of contacts before student got into school

3 None
2 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
3 More than 4 times

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

H. Pomona (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

5 Counselling about career and education goals
4 Information about admissions
3 Help filling out admissions forms
2 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
7 Information about financial aid
6 Help filling out financial aid application forms
4 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
2 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

2 Would not have got into school without this help
5 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
1 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

3 None
2 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
3 More than 4 times

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 1/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
2	0	Academic or career counselling
0	0	Personal or family counselling
2	0	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
2	1	Financial aid or employment
1	0	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

2 Would not have stayed in school without this help
3 Helped a great deal
0 Helped some
1 Not really much help
2 Did not help
1 No answer

1/Four students received no follow-up support services.

H. Pomona (cont'd)

22. We would appreicate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"I really don't know about anyone else, but as for me the school is all right. I haven't come across any difficulties as yet."

"I feel one of the major problems is getting financial aid or having enough money. Lack of money sometimes is the reason why kids drop out of school."

"Need more info. regarding school and how to go about enrolling."

"There is not enough career counselling for students who may desire a degree. I took a course in cinema, thinking I would learn script writing; it was not a part of this course. Proper counselling would have prevented me from wasting a great deal of time."

"The distance from home. Lacks personal attention--I have seen my counselor only once. Class work is difficult but one has a hard time in college to finish it."

"Getting a part-time job to fit your school's schedule."

"Money! I have a family and I feel that if it weren't such a sacrifice financially my grades and attitude would be much better."

"Filling out financial forms. Counselling about careers. Where to go for help with school work."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"The counselors are there to guide you if you need help and also help you get financial aid if you are eligible."

"To tell you the truth I don't know where I heard this."

"Helping and understanding applications and requirements for college."

"They help out in filling out financial application. They also help by giving information of admissions and where to go for help on campus."

"One: help get to college, two: financial aid."

"Everything, counselling, etc."

"They help to get grants."

"The only thing LULAC did for me was to acquaint me with the various grants that were available. In that respect they were quite helpful, however, in every other aspect of enrolling I was groping in the dark. This was quite difficult for someone who had been out of school for more than 20 years."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"Keep in contact with the students after they have enrolled in school. Help older students become aware of school facilities. For example, I have high blood pressure and down the long walk from the parking lot is very difficult. It wasn't until I became ill at school that I found out that I had qualified for elevator and medical parking privileges."

"I don't really know."

"They need more help to give better services to caseload and more money could be made available to them. More work studies."

"Let the students know that there is a place like LULAC."

"More info. about different majors."

"I really haven't been that much to the center, but as for the people that do go there, it helps them."

"I am currently very pleased with the way the center operates."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

I. San Francisco

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1973 through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out	45
Number not returned by post office*	36
Number returned completed	6

Enrolled now?

4	Yes
1	No
1	Graduated

Ethnicity of Respondents

3	Mexican Americans
1	"Latin"
1	Anglo
1	Puerto Rican

Age of Respondents

4	18-20 years old
2	21-25 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

2	High School Counselor
2	Someone from center came to school
1	Friends referred
1	Poster or other publicity
0	Other

Status at time of first contact

2	In high school
2	Graduated from high school, not in college
2	Graduated from high school, in college

Number of contacts before student got into school

2	None
2	3-4 times
1	More than 4 times
1	No answer

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

I. San Francisco (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

3 Counselling about career and education goals
4 Information about admissions
5 Help filling out admissions forms
2 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
3 Information about financial aid
3 Help filling out financial aid application forms
3 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
2 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

2 Would not have got into school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
4 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
0 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

1 None
2 1-2 times
1 3-4 times
1 More than 4 times
1 No answer

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment 1/

Provided by	Referred by	Service
1	2	Academic or career counselling
1	0	Personal or family counselling
0	2	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	0	Housing
1	2	Financial aid or employment
0	2	Social activities
0	0	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

1 Would not have stayed in school without this help
2 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
1 Not really much help
0 Did not help
1 No answer

1/Four students received no follow-up support services.

I. San Francisco (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"Getting into school was no problem or even getting help (tutors). My problem was actually me, my background, my high school education wasn't well enough, therfore it affected and affects my education now for the reason that I sometimes find it above my head."

"The worse ones was the financial aid and transportation. Getting to whatever college they chose. It would help if they had a bus for all those students to take."

"Teachers are one. Books are another."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"They do encourage you to go to school or further your education. They also help in financial aid too. But still transportation is hard to come by."

"Getting in school can and has been a hassle for some students but the counselors are there to keep on pushing. Sometimes when the students don't make it in, the counselors give them encouragement and hope."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"I think the counselors have a lot of material to cover; meaning they have a lot of clients too. I think if they had more counselors it would be most beneficial to the students because the work would be evenly distributed and the counselors would be able to assist the students with more time."

"Just keep helping them with their education. It could help if they would find part-time jobs for them too if no financial aid is available except from the government."

"Counselling."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

J. Seattle

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled Dec. 1974 through Mar. 1977; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 18
Number not returned by post office* 12
Number returned completed 1

Ethnicity of Respondents

1 Mexican American

Enrolled now?

1 Yes
0 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

1 18-20 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

0 High School Counselor
1 Someone from center came to school
0 Friends referred
0 Poster or other publicity
0 Other

Status at time of first contact

1 In high school
__ Graduated from high school, not in college
__ Graduated from high school, in college

Number of contacts before student got into school

1 3-4 times

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

J. Seattle (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

0 Counselling about career and education goals
1 Information about admissions
1 Help filling out admissions forms
0 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar)
1 Information about financial aid
1 Help filling out financial aid application forms
1 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
0 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school

0 Would not have got into school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really very much help
0 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

1 None

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment

Provided by	Referred by	Service
		Academic or career counselling
		Personal or family counselling
		Tutoring
		Legal assistance
		Child care
		Housing
	1	Financial aid or employment
		Social activities
		Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

0 Would not have stayed in school without this help
0 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
0 Not really much help
0 Did not help

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problem students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"For me financial aid forms are a pain to fill out and they helped me fill it out."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"They helped me fill out forms for college and prepared me when I first started."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"I really think the center is worth it helping people who are planning their education past high school. I really can't think of anything at the moment that the center could do differently to help students."

ANALYSIS of STUDENT QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

K. Topeka

Sample drawn from list of students enrolled 1973 through Oct. 1976; number in sample is 3% of total enrollment.

Number of questionnaires mailed out 33
Number not returned by post office* 31
Number returned completed 16

Ethnicity of Respondents

12 Mexican Americans
2 Black
1 Anglo
1 Native American

Enrolled now?

12 Yes
4 No
0 Graduated

Age of Respondents

8 18-20 years old
5 21-25 years old
3 31-45 years old

How did student first hear about LNESC?

2 High School Counselor
4 Someone from center came to school
4 Friends referred
[illegible] Poster or other publicity
3 1) Other

1) One student learned about LNESC when someone from the center came to college; another received a letter from the center as first contact, while another hadn't heard of the center.

Status at time of first contact

7 In high school
3 Graduated from high school, not in college
3 Graduated from high school, in college
1 Graduated from college
1 No answer
1 High school drop out

Number of contacts before student got into school

6 None
1 1-2 times
2 3-4 times
5 More than 4 times
2 No answer

*Questionnaires not returned by the post office were presumably delivered.

K. Topeka (cont'd)

Services provided by center before enrollment (initial service)

6 Counselling about career and education goals
8 Information about admissions
4 Help filling out admissions forms
4 Active help with admissions procedure (for example, counselor accompanied you to college registrar) [1]
9 Information about financial aid
5 Help filling out financial aid application forms
3 Active help with the procedure of obtaining financial aid (for example, Center itself gave you a scholarship)
3 Introduction to other people or agencies who could help you
0 Other

How much students says these services actually helped in getting into school [2]

3 Would not have got into school without this help
3 Helped a great deal
1 Helped some
4 Not really very much help
2 Did not help

Number of contacts with Center since student has been in school

4 None
3 1-2 times
6 3-4 times
1 More than 4 times
2 No answer

Kinds of services student received from Center after enrollment [3]

Provided by	Referred by	Service
4	0	Academic or career counselling
1	0	Personal or family counselling
0	1	Tutoring
0	0	Legal assistance
0	0	Child care
0	1	Housing
3	5	Financial aid or employment
0	0	Social activities
0	1	Other

How much student says these services helped in staying in school

3 Would not have stayed in school without this help
2 Helped a great deal
2 Helped some
0 Not really much help
4 Did not help
5 No answer

1/One had help in finance applications to law school.
2/Three students didn't answer this question.
3/Five students received no follow-up support services.

K. Topeka (cont'd)

I feel like the people at LULAC are my friends and they are willing to help me with my problems and give me the support I need."

"One, helps the student obtain financial aid; two, helps the student enroll. Three, checks on the student to make sure everything is okay after she is in college."

"I don't know, they never were in touch personally while I have been attending school for the past two years."

24. What do you think the center could do differently that would make it more helpful to students?

"Get in touch with students personally or at least make arrangements to do so more often."

"Call much more often and help you find a job etc."

"I am not sure of all the services that LULAC offers, but I think it should change the time they get in touch with students. I believe the center only contacts seniors and those who have already graduated. I think the latest that the center should offer their help would be junior year of high school. Many students aren't sure or even aware of the information or help they could get from services like yours, and because of this even though students are really interested in continuing their education would quit or become less interested in high school. I think that this is one of the reasons that high school students don't do so well. The high school counselors only help them until they have graduated, but where do they go for help after that."

"Better location. Parking bad."

"I think they do everything that is needed. I mean what else can a person ask for. Good healthy communication helps."

"I couldn't really say--I myself did not have much contact with LULAC."

"I have no idea-they did not help me. This Mexican lady and I both went to the LULAC office together for help to enter (college). She got help there, I did not. The staff there was 85 percent Mexican. Results gave me the impression LULAC was there to help the Mexican people. Did not know this or I wouldn't have gone there for help in the first place being Indian. Mexicans do not like Indians."

"Go out and express themselves not just once or twice but keep in contact. They only keep in contact with certain people."

"One problem college students face is lack of preparation in high school, especially in Math and English. The center could do a great service by impressing on students while they are in

K. Topeka (cont'd)

22. We would appreciate your comments on the problems students face getting into school and staying in school. What are some of the difficulties you have come across?

"Every student seems to think school is glorious, and there aren't any problems. Well, as you and I both know that isn't so at all. I personally think that every student should check out the school he or she wants to attend to the fullest extent. There is a lot of bull that goes on at school and students should know what exactly goes on!!"

"Money is a big problem. Also having the confidence to enrolling in college and then being able to make the grades."

"The fact is that I don't study hard enough."

"I do not know how to go about getting into school, and I do not have any money but I knew that I wanted to go to college."

"Money."

"Getting use to college life is about the only problem I had. Many high school teachers don't stress study techniques, which I think would relieve a lot of pressure that new students have."

"Unfamiliar with the campus. I personally felt, to some extent still do, that I am not intelligent enough to be in college even at my age with vast amounts of practical experience."

"Finding teachers that can get the point across clearly enough for certain individuals. However, not enough time for studying all subjects for the next day."

"I felt that I was not ready for college because I had just barely graduated and I needed the rest. I wasn't really motivated just kind of went to satisfy my parents. (Financial, transportation, school work)." (Student dropped out of the state university and does not plan to graduate)

"The only difficulty I came across was financial."

"My race and sex: I was told over and over to go to the BIA for help and was told there that they couldn't help. Also went to the Indian Center in Topeka: no help there. I finally got a personal loan from the Chaplain from a large university. Also was told to find a man, get married and forget school."

"Not many Mexican Americans show concern and if so they only show for a while, meaning LULAC centers."

K. Topeka (cont'd)

"Financial-should have different guidelines for larger families."

"My situation is different from those who responded in this survey. I use LULAC services to get into law school. I was already in school when I first heard of LULAC. Problems for getting into law school are obtaining information regarding admissions and financing admission fees."

"My personal contact with LULAC was to secure additional financial assistance. I am a divorcee, but I do have four children, AFDC recipient. I was already enrolled in law school when I contacted LULAC. Finances have been most difficult for me."

"Deciding what career I wanted to go into. Considerable confidence and guidance."

23. What do you think are some of the best things the LULAC education center does to help students overcome these difficulties?

"They give them encouragement to achieve and accomplish their goals. They help them with financial difficulty and with social problems."

"In my case, the center was very helpful in contacting various law schools to determine my status. The center is also good for encouragement."

"Giving places to find information."

"I don't know what LULAC does to help students because I don't use LULAC's service."

"They help you if you happen to be a Mexican."

"LULAC made me aware of the various financial aid progran that were open to me."

"Well, they talked to us, they gave us advice, answered questions, helped obtain papers needed. They helped you through till the first day of school. They are very helpful and I am sure they go the same procedures Upward Bound does and they helped me through it." (the student informed us that Upward Bound had helped obtain tutoring, counselling, housing, and financial aid)."

"I had never had the opportunity to visit the center." (Student was in Kansas City)

"They visited campus with the potential students. They already know their way around."

"My counselor told me about the financial aid and that I might be eligible for it and helped me fill out the forms for admission and financial aid. Helped me with the writing too.

high school they need to take good, solid preparatory courses."

"Interested advisors."

"LULAC does not have a center in our city (OMAHA) my contact with LULAC has been strictly with correspondence."

"I really cannot think of anything else that they have not accomplished in doing so. I personally was satisfied with the service they had given me."

APPENDIX IV

FOLLOW-UP/RETENTION PROCEDURES

Exhibit A: Albuquerque's Mail-Out to Students

Date:

Please fill out & return today.

Name____
Curr. Address____________________________________
_____________________________ Zip_______________
Phone #_____________________
Are you presently attending any college, univ or vocational school Yes________ No________
Name of School___________________________________
Level______ Part-time____ Full-time_______
What service can we provide for you at this time?

Postage Will Be Paid by Addressee

No Postage Stamp Necessary If Mailed in the United States

BUSINESS REPLY MAIL
First Class Permit No. 2660 Albuquerque, NM

LULAC Education Service Center
Tower Plaza Building
510 2nd Street, NW Suite 209
Albuquerque, NM 87102

APPENDIX IV
FOLLOW-UP/RETENTION PROCEDURES

Exhibit B.

LULAC EDUCATIONAL SERVICE CENTER
CLIENT HISTORY FORM

LAST NAME

FIRST NAME

MI

SS#

NAME, ADDRESS, CITY, & ZIP

TELEPHONE:

Date of Entry	Male	Female	Disadvantaged Criteria

COUNSELOR:

SCHOOL ATTENDING:

CONTACT A RESULT OF:

ETHNIC BACKGROUND:

PROGRAM STATUS:

EDUCATIONAL MAJOR:

ENTRANCE EXAMINATIONS
(Indicate date)

☐ ACT ________ SCORE ________ ☐ SAT ________ SCORE ________ ☐ OTHER ________ SCORE ________

ADMISSIONS

COLLEGE CHOICES ________ ________ ________

DATE APPLIED ________ ________ ________

DATE ACCEPTED ________ ________ ________

ENROLLED: ________ ________
Institution Date

FINANCIAL AID APPLICATIONS

Needs Analysis ________ ________ ________
General Application ________ ________ ________
H/H ________ ________ ________
SEOG ________ ________ ________
CWSP ________ ________ ________
FISL ________ ________ ________
NDSL ________ ________ ________
BEOG ________ ________ ________
Other (Specify) ________ ________ ________

HOUSING

☐ DORMS ☐ OFF CAMPUS HOUSING ☐ COMMUTING ☐ RELATIVES

☐ OTHER (EXPLAIN) ________

FINANCIAL AID AWARDS

Academic Year	BEOG	SEOG	H/H	NDSL	FISL	University Grant	SCHOLARSHIPS (Specify)	TOTAL

(Back side of card)

SESSION REPORTS

DATE OF ENTRY	ACTION	COUNSELOR TIME

APPENDIX V

SURVEY OF FISCAL OPERATIONS
LULAC National Education Service Centers
As of June 1977

V.1 Salaries and Wages

V.1.1 LNESC salaries and wages were compared to average salaries in metropolitant areas from U.S. government statistics.[1] LNESC clerical and administrative salaries are somewhat lower than average.

V.2 Fringe Benefits

V.2.1 In January 1976 the Internal Revenue Service granted LNESC tax-exempt status under Section 509 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code. The LNESC audit for fiscal year 1976 notes that:

V.2.2

> As a result of this recognition as a tax-exempt organization, the corporation has established a personal security program to substitute the benefits employees receive under Social Security. These are long-term disability, survivor's benefits and a tax-sheltered annuity plan open only to employees of groups recognized under Section 501 (c)(3) of the Internal Revenue Code... This plan was authorized by resolution of the Corporation's Board of Directors with the cognizance of the CSA program offices. Employer and employee each contribute 5.85% of compensation up to $15,300.

The personal security program was described to R&PO staff during our visit to LNESC Headquarters; however, no mention of the program appears in the LNESC Personnel Policies Manual nor the LNESC Classification Compensation Plan. *Director's Comment:* "The LNESC Personal Security Plan when first established was explained to employees in a series of informational memoranda made available to the evaluators. New employees are given a packet of information on the plan within their first week of employment. And the plan is described in Fiscal Memorandum-8, a permanent policy document."

V.2.3 Salary increases follow the guidelines outlined in CSA Instruction 6900-01.

---

[1] *U.S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, National Survey of Professional, Administrative, Technical and Clearical Pay--March 1976, Bulleting 1931, 1976.*

V.2.4 Sick leave and over-time are comparable to local public and private non-profit agencies. However, vacation policy is far more liberal than comparable agencies. LNESC grants 4 weeks (20 days) of vacation after completion of six months of employment to all employess. U.S. government statistics[2] show that vacation is generally granted on a graduated basis, i.e. one week after six months, about 2 weeks after one year, and four weeks not until considerable length of service (10 to 20 years). To bring it in line with comparable agencies, LNESC might consider raising its salaries somewhat, and adopting a graduated vacation plan.

V.2.5 Salaries and wages and fringe benefits have accounted for 69% of the total grant expenditures for the three program years examined (PY I = 66%, PY II = 72%, PY III = 71%).

V.3 Expenditures

V.3.1 Expenditures per year were computed for headquarters, for each center, for all centers together, and in total. Expenditures were divided into fixed expenditures (the constant expenditures--operating costs) and variable expenditures (one-time expenditures as needed, e.g. travel and consultants).[3] Table V.1 shows fixed and variable expenditures by LNESC for all centers, for headquarters, and total, for three program years (from October 1, 1972 to September 30, 1976). Table V.1 expenditure categories, as reported by LNESC, do not coincide exactly with CSA budget categories.[4]

---

[2] *U.S. Dept. of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Handbook of Labor Statistics 1976, Bulletin 1905, 1976.*

[3] *Fixed expenditures = salaries and wages, fringe benefits, audit (accounting services), employees' in-town travel, employees' out-of-town travel (for headquarters only), space costs and rental, consumable supplies, lease and purchase of equipment, and other direct expenses--telephone, printing and publications, licenses, insurance, and repair of equipment (which should be included in lease and purchase of equipment. Variable expenditures = secretarial services (temporary); consultants; employee development; interest; beneficiary costs; and travel--employees' out-of-town (centers only), consultants', beneficiary, and board of directors.*

[4] *In particular, CSA Instruction 7570-4 requires that "utilities" be reported in category 2.6, but LNESC includes them in 2.2; likewise, "maintenance" should be in 2.2, rather that 2.6; "office supplies" (over $50), reported in 2.3, should be in 2.4; and "secretarial services" (temporary), which is reported in 1.3, should be included in 1.1.* Director's comment: *"LNESC expenditure categories have been approved by CSA and auditors for the past three years."*

V.4 Travel

V.4.1 LNESC Fiscal Memorandum No. 2 instructs center directors that line items in the budget are flexible "within the discretion of each director." This statement is not in compliance with CSA Instruction 7570-3 which states that travel may not be increased by more than 25% above the budgeted amounts. *Director's Comment:* "On LNESC policy concerning budget flexibility we believe the evaluators (are) referring to LNESC directives on travel to our field centers. However, mention should (be) made that movement of money into or out of the travel category of the total budget conforms with CSA instructives."

V.4.2 Tables V.2 and V.3 show consultants and consultants' travel expenditures, a variable expenditure item. Greatest expenditures for consultants and consultant travel occurred during Program Year I and has declined each year since then, according to headquarters budget sheets.[5]

---

[5] *This information was gathered from budget sheets (expenditures) calculated by LNESC Headquarters fiscal office (Table V.2); headquarters also provided R&PO with backup invoices, etc. for consultants and consultants' travel (Table V.3). Matching the backup to the budget sheets proved quite difficult. The following comparisons highlight the lack of congruence:*

PY I (23 mo.)	*Amount shown in backup files*	*Amount shown on HQ budget sheet*
Consultants	*$17,434*	*$24,445*
Consultants' travel	*2,801*	*6,696*
PY II (10 mo.)		
Consultants	*570*	*6,364*
Consultants' travel	*542*	*2,462*
PY III (12 mo.)		
Consultants	*1,575*	*1,394*
Consultants' travel	*3,030*	*282*

In the first two years, then, there was no backup for $10,906 of the expenditures; in the second program year, $6,602 are not backed up by invoices, etc. However, in the third program year (1975-76) the opposite appears--there is backup for $2,929 more in expenditures than is recorded on the budget sheet.

TABLE V.1
Fixed & Variable Expenditures - LNESC, Inc.
For Centers, Headquarters and Total, By Program Year

	Program Yr. I[1]			Program Yr II[2]			Program Yr. III[3]			All Program Years		
	Oct. 1, 1972 - Nov. 30, 1974			Dec. 1, 1974- Sept. 30, 1975			Oct. 1, 1975-Sept. 30, 1976					
	Centers	Hqtrs.	Total	Centers	Hqtrs.	Total	Centers	Hqtrs.	Total	Centers	Hqtrs.	Total
Fixed Expenditures												
Salaries and Wages	$ 972,197	$189,429	$1,161,626	$550,298	125,129	$ 675,427	$626,882	$150,897	$ 777.779	$2,149,377	$ 465.455	$2.614,832
Fringe Benefits	51,408	76,738	128.146	35.360	44,776	80,136	47,849	41,559	89,408	134,617	163.073	297.690
Audit (accounting serv.)	9.806	8,088	17,894	3,514	16,833	20.347	0	2.500	2,500	13,320	27,421	40.741
Travel: Employee in-town	34,380	9,671	44,051	18,527	1,110	19,637	23,751	850	24,601	76,635	11,631	88,266
Travel: Employee out-of-town (HQ.)	-	64,802	64,802	-	22,852	22,852	-	33.642	33.642	-	121,296	121.296
Space Costs and Rentals	67,436	33,376	100.812	43.598	21,925	65.523	57.338	27.048	84,386	168,372	82,349	250,721
Consumable Supplies	41.492	13.349	54,841	18.741	7,656	26,397	29,954	13,932	43,886	90,187	34,937	125,124
Lease and Purchase-Equipt.	66,479	28,[illegible]18	95.197	24,830	8,039	32,869	18,450	8,498	26,948	109,759	45,255	155,014
Other Direct: Telephone	46,958	23.551	70.509	30,610	13,322	43,932	42,809	22,539	65,348	120,377	59,412	179,789
Other Direct: Printing, Public.	9.859	8,845	18,704	3,347	1.947	5,294	6,821	14,895	21,716	20,027	25,687	45,714
Other Direct: Licenses	0	28	28	(127)	13	(114)	231	72	303	104	113	217
Other Direct: Insurance	705	2.231	2,936	505	4,445	4,950	0	7,014	7,014	1.210	13.690	14,900
Other Direct: Repair Equipt.	1,585	427	2,012	2,064	1,920	3,984	2.697	3,619	6,316	6,346	5,966	12,312
Total - Fixed Expenditures	$1,302,305	$459,253	$1,761,558	$731,267	269,967	$1,001,234	$856,782	$327.065	$1,183.847	$2,890,331	$1,056.285	$3,946,616
Average monthly	56,622	19,968	76,589	73,127	26,997	100,123	70,991	27,255	98,654			
Variable Expenditures												
Secretarial Services	$ 1,379	$ 3,409	$ 4,788	$ 1.747	243	$ 1,990	$ 1,961	$ 1,447	$ 3,408	$ 5,087	$ 5,099	$ 10,186
Consultants	5,734	19,711	25,445	2.252	4,112	6,364	187	1,207	1,394	8.173	25.030	33.203
Travel: Employee out-of-town	69,061	-	69,061	16,893	-	16,893	13,669	-	13,669	99,623	-	99.623
Travel: Consultants (Centers)	611	6,085	6,696	2,462	0	2.462	0	282	282	3,073	6,367	9.440
Travel: Beneficiary	397	20	417	0	0	0	457	158	615	854	178	1,032
Travel: Board	0	70,375	70,375	0	9,350	9.350	60	12,512	12,572	60	92,237	92,297
Employee Development	6,012	5,760	11,772	3,277	2.286	5,563	4,008	5.533	9,541	13,297	13,579	26,870
Interest	0	0	0	26	959	985	51	198	249	77	1,157	1,234
Beneficiary Costs	423	0	423	346	15	361	127	0	127	896	15	911
Total - Variable Expenditures	$ 83,617	$150,360	$ 188,977	$ 27,003	16,965	$ 43,968	$ 20,520	$ 21,337	$ 41,857	$ 131,140	$ 143,662	$ 274,802
Average monthly	3,636	4,581	8,216	2,730	1,697	4,397	1,710	1,778	3,488			
Grand Total Expenditures	$1,385,922	$564,613	$1,950,535	$758,270	286,932	$1,045,202	$877,302	$348,402	$1,225,704	$3,021,471	$1,199,947	$4,221,418
Average monthly	60,257	24,548	84,806	75,827	28,693	104,520	73,109	29,033	101,735			

[1] Average monthly figures for PYI are computed on the basis of 23 months of operation (from January, 1973). Individual centers began operation at various times after that, however, so a typical month's expenditures for centers would actually be higher than shown. (See also Table 5).

[2] Ten months of operation

[3] Twelve months of operation

TABLE V.2
Consultants' Fees and Consultants' Travel Expenditures[1]

CONSULTANTS

PYI
(Per. ending 11/30/74)

Center	Amount
Boston	$ 2,720
Colo. Sp.	536
Houston	2,037
Phoenix	91
Pomona	350
Headquarters	19,711
Total-Consultants	$25,445

PYII
(12/1/74 to 9/30/75)

Center	Dec 74	Jan-Jn 75	Jul 75	Aug 75	Sep 75	Total
Boston	0	$1,510	$216	$189	$ 0	$1,915
Colo. Sp.	$162	0	0	0	0	162
Houston	0	0	0	8	0	8
S. F.	0	0	8	7	0	15
Seattle	0	120	17	15	0	152
Headquarters	0	2,165	347	0	1,600	4,112
Total-Consultants						$6,364

PYIII
(10/1/75 to 9/30/76)

Center	Amount
Boston	$ 122
Pomona	65
Headq.	1,207
Total-Consultants	$1,394

CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL

Center	Amount
Boston	$ 355
Chicago	256
Headquarters	6,085
Total-Consultants' Travel	$6,696

Center	Dec 74	Jan-Jn 75	Jul 75	Aug 75	Sep 75	Total
Boston	0	$ 765	$109	$ 96	0	$ 970
Chicago	0	1,177	168	147	0	1,492
Total-Consultants' Travel						$2,462

Center	Amount
Headq.	$282
Total-Consultants' Travel	$282

---

[1] *From LNESC headquarters green budget sheets.*

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

MAR 3 1978

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGES

TABLE V.3
Consultants and Consultants' Travel Expenditures
From consultants file and consultants' travel file (LNESC HQ)

PY I: Period ending November 30, 1974

Date	Consultant	Center	Amount	Reason
4/73	David Florence	SF	$4,800	Unknown
5/73	David Florence	SF	6,000	Unknown
5/73	Regino Montes	SF	150	Research, editorial work
6/73	Victor Munoz	SF	208	Unknown
7/73	Victor Munoz	SF	340	Unknown
7/73	Julio Garcia	SF	800	Unknown
9/73	ATM Systems	HQ	1,000	NESC brochure
9/73	Al Velasquez	?	100	Unknown
10/73	Thomas Rolando	HQ	100	Logo
10/73	Leo Fraga	CC	100	Logo
10/73	Armando Reudon	HQ	300	Article for publication
11/73	Armando Reudon	HQ	300	Brochure
1/74	Thomas Rolando	HQ	50	Logo
3/74	Reuben Aragon	Hous	336	Modify MIS
3/74	Manuel Madrigal	HQ	750	Rewrite grant proposal
5/74	Manuel Madrigal	HQ	300	Technical asst. in developing refunding proposal
5/74	Rey Lopez	HQ	300	Article for natl.dissem.
6/74	Susan Yoble	HQ	100	Preparation of proposal
6/74	Manuel Madrigal	HQ	100	Unknown
6/74	Gilbert Ojeda	SF	300	Develop resource center
6/74	Rey Lopez	HQ	1,000	Reorganization of activity reports, etc.
	TOTAL-CONSULTANTS:		$17,434	

CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL

Date	Consultant	City	Amount	Reason
4/73	David Florence	SF	$ 554	Misc.travel for Fb-Apr'73
5/73	David Florence	SF	88	B.O.D. Meeting
6/73	David Florence	SF	239	Unknown
6/73	David Florence	SF	43	Unknown
6/73	David Florence	SF	158	Unknown
6/73	David Florence	SF	140	Unknown
11/73	Reuben Aragon	Hous	60	Training session, Denver
11/73	Reuben Aragon	Hous	306	Training session, Denver
12/73	Dan Curlee	D.C.	78	Corporate counsel
12/73	Richard Bela	D.C.	394	Corporate counsel
12/73	John Haymaker	D.C.	143	Accounting manual
12/73	Reuben Aragon	Hous	223	Unknown
12/73	James Cruz	D.C.	300	Statistics, Chicago
1/74	Richard Bela	D.C.	75	Corporate counsel
TOTAL-CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL:			$2,801	

TABLE V.3
Consultants and Consultants' Travel Expenditures
From consultants file and consultants' travel file (LNESC HQ)

PY II: December 1, 1974 to September 30, 1975

CONSULTANTS

Date	Consultant	Center	Amount	Reason
2/75	A.B. Romero	HQ	$ 500	Personnel manual
8/75	E.A. Avedondo	SF	50	Testimony
8/75	R.Solorzando	HQ	20	Scholarship committee
	TOTAL-CONSULTANTS:		$ 570	

CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL

Date	Consultant	To City	Amount	Reason
12/74	Arnold Gonzales	D.C.	$ 378	Unknown
9/75	Caesar Trimble	D.C.	164	LNESC Mgmnt. Seminar
	TOTAL-CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL:		$ 542	

PY III: October 1, 1975 to September 30, 1976

CONSULTANTS

Date	Consultant	Center	Amount	Reason
8/76	TransCentury Fnd. (Brenda Eddy)	HQ	$1,050	Mgmnt. Training Directors Conference
?	R.K. Irish	HQ	125	Personnel Mgmnt. Seminar
9/76	Jim Singleton	Phoenix	400	LULAC Supreme Council
	TOTAL-CONSULTANTS:		$1,575	

CONSULTANTS' TRAVEL

Date	Consultant	To City	Amount	Reason
8/76	Brenda Eddy	D.C.	$ 314	LNESC Directors Conf.
9/76	A.G. de Los Santos	Denver	164	Training, Counselors Conf.
9/76	Gregory Ochoa	Denver	512	Training, Counselors Conf.
9/76	Caesar Trimble	Denver	519	Training, Counselors Conf.
9/76	A. Gallegos	Colo.Sp.	155	Outline for Develop. of Educational Counseling Center
9/76	A. Gallegos	Colo.Sp.	437	
9/76	Ralph Alvarez	Denver	929	Coord. Trng., Counselors conference
	TOTAL-CONSULTANTS'TRAVEL		$3,030	